VOL. VIII, NO. 1 JANUARY, 1930

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY

Editor:- ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

A REVIEW OF RELIGIOUS LIFE AND THOUGHT

CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF ENGLAND AND WALES,
MEMORIAL HALL, LONDON, E.C. 4.

Price Two Shillings & Sixpence net.

For Contents see page V.

OUR ALIGNMENT

BRITISH CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES = LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY

has given fresh confidence in all the Mission Stations that a great constituency stands behind them.

THE GREAT PRIVILEGE.

Our Congregational share of the Missionary Enterprise is now "broad based" at home, as well as being "widespread" abroad. The burden being shared by all can more easily be borne—rather, we share a great privilege.

THE SPLENDID OPPORTUNITY.

Let Congregationalism but consecrate some of its best young life, and a fair proportion of its money, and a great and immediate advance towards the Kingdom will be registered to the abounding glory of our Churches.

OFFERS OF SERVICE
and
GIFTS OF MONEY
to

Rev. W. Nelson Bitton, Home Secretary L.M.S., Livingstone House, Broadway, Westminster, S.W. 1.

The Congregational Quarterly

Editor:
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Editorial Board:
MR. B. L. MANNING, M.A. | REV. ARTHUR PRINGLE.
REV. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D. | REV. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D.
MR. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY is published on the 20th of March, June, September, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the publishers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any bookseller at 2s. 6d.

All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at Shirley, Russell Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Vol. VIII, No. 1 JANUARY, 1930

CONTENTS.

[*For biographical sketches of the contributors see p. vii.*]

EDITORIAL - - - - - - - - - - 1
THE CHURCH'S FAILURE - - - - - - A. GORDON JAMES 9
THE DOCTRINE OF THE FALLIBILITY OF JESUS A. D. MARTIN 16
THE INDIVIDUAL AND MORAL PROGRESS - - H. F. LOVELL COCKS 28
EDUCATION—THE NEW SITUATION - - - - D. S. JOHNS 35
ENGLAND'S INDEBTEDNESS TO NONCONFORMITY MUSICALLY - - - - - ORLANDO MANSFIELD 44
"JESUS NAZARENUS" - - - - - - - C MORELL BAINTON 54
THE LAST SUPPER - - - - - - - - EDWARD GRUBB 57
HOW TO CONSIDER A CALL: R. W. DALE AS EXEMPLAR - - - - - - - - - ALBERT PEEL 64
THE HAND: A POEM - - - - - - - - MARJORIE NOEL HOW 69
DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS—
PRACTICE AND THEORY, AND THE MINISTER W. S. FERRIE 70
A FELLOWSHIP OF PRAYER - - - - - N. A. TURNER-SMITH 74
CHRIST'S WORK FOR THE CHILDREN - - W. MORTON BARWELL 78
CHILDREN AND THE OFFERTORY - - - W. H. STUBBS 80
ON LIFE AND BOOKS:
PEPYS AND THE PREACHERS - - - - D. J. SHEPPARD 82
FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS: RELIGIOUS EDUCATION J. P. NAISH 85
FOREIGN REVIEWS - - - - A. C. UNDERWOOD and W. B. SELBIE 90
CURRENT LITERATURE. By the EDITOR, Drs. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, R. S. FRANKS, W. B. SELBIE, R. MACKINTOSH, Mr. H. B. SHEPHEARD, M.A., Mr. H. N. DIXON, M.A., F.L.S. - - - - - - - - - - - - 91
SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST. By the EDITOR, Drs. SYDNEY CAVE, A. J. GRIEVE, Rev. A. PRINGLE, DRS. R. S. FRANKS, R. MACKINTOSH, Mr. H. B. SHEPHEARD, M.A. - - - - - - - - - - - - 104
PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS - - - - - - - - - - - 126
CORRESPONDENCE. THE FREE CHURCHES AND UNITY. Rev. J. E. FOWLER 128

(Made and Printed in Great Britain.)

WHY CONGREGATIONALISTS NEED

Public Opinion

BECAUSE it gives them a handy summary of the best thought and activity of the best men and women of the day, thus helping them to keep in touch and up-to-date with all that is worth knowing.

BECAUSE it is a Newspaper Room, a Weekly Library of New Books, and always a cheerful and well-informed companion. It gives a rapid survey of the events of the week, and covers a remarkably wide area of interests.

BECAUSE it is interested in Social Problems, in Religion, in Politics, in Science, in Travel, in Literature, in all Arts and Crafts, and in everything that interests intelligent people.

BECAUSE it gives opinion on world matters in a compact form; to sum up, because it is a weekly review of what people think, say and do, and the new books they are reading.

WHY NOT SEND YOUR FRIENDS ABROAD A COPY EACH WEEK? THEY WILL APPRECIATE IT?

Write to the Manager, "PUBLIC OPINION," 44 Essex Street, London, W.C.2, for particulars of reduced subscription rate for missionaries on service abroad, and for a free copy of the current issue.

SMEDLEY'S

No Branch Establishments.

GREAT BRITAIN'S GREATEST HYDRO.

Without Superior for Comfort, Pleasure and Health. 270 Bedrooms. Moderate Tariff. Magnificent Grounds of Ten Acres.

WRITE FOR FREE ILLUSTRATED PROSPECTUS

MATLOCK

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

Rev A. Gordon James, Head of the Edinburgh Wesleyan Mission.

Rev. A. D. Martin, Congregational Minister; author of *Aspects of the Way, etc.*

Rev. H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., B.D., Congregational Minister, Leeds.

Rev. D. S. Johns, M.A., Congregational Minister, Stalybridge.

Prof. Orlando Mansfield, Mus.Doc., F.R.C.O., F.A.G.O., organist and composer.

Mr. Edward Grubb, M.A., of the Society of Friends; author of many books on biblical and theological subjects.

Rev. C. Morell Bainton, B.A., B.D., Congregational Minister, Goole.

Rev. W. S. Ferrie, M.A., Presbyterian Minister, Birmingham.

Rev. N. A. Turner-Smith, M.A., Congregational Minister, Ramsgate.

Rev. W. Morton Barwell, M.A., Congregational Minister, St. Albans.

Rev. W. H. Stubbs, B.A., Presbyterian Minister, Chorlton-cum-Hardy.

Rev. D. J. Sheppard, Baptist Minister, Wellingborough.

The Best Lesson Helps for 1930.

In making your choice be sure to include :—

The Graded School Quarterlies.

Edited by BERTHA C. KRALL.

Invaluable for their Articles and full helps on the Graded Lessons.

PRIMARY	... ...	9d. net.
JUNIOR	... ...	9d. net.
INTERMEDIATE	...	9d. net.

The Concise Guide Quarterlies.

By ERNEST H. HAYES.

The Handy Guides to Good Teaching. Intensely practical and suggestive.

PRIMARY	... ...	9d. net.
JUNIOR	... ...	9d. net.
INTERMEDIATE	...	9d. net.

Postage on all the above, 1½d. per copy extra. Specimen copies post free to Teachers.

ANNUAL VOLUMES.

Notes on the Scripture Lessons.

By J. EATON PEASEY.

The year's Helps to the Junior and International Lessons. Illustrated.

Cloth boards **4/6** each, limp covers **3/6** each. By post **3½**d. extra.

Also in Monthly parts, **3**d. net. By post **4**d.

Edited by ERNEST H. HAYES.

The Primary Concise Guide

to the Beginners' and Primary Lessons for the Year. Illustrated.

The Junior Concise Guide

to the Junior and International Lessons for the Year. Illustrated.

The Intermediate Concise Guide

to the Intermediate Lessons for the year. Illustrated.

Each volume in cloth boards, **4/6** net. Limp covers, **3/6** net. By post, **4½**d. extra.

THE BEST PICTURES

On the Graded Lessons.
Beautifully printed in Colours.

On the *Primary* Lessons :

The Primary Picture Roll.

12 Pictures, wall size, **7/6** net. By post **8**/-.

The Primary Lesson Cards.

13 Cards in pkt., **2½**d. each. By post, **1**d. extra on 5 pkts.

On the *Junior* Lessons :

The International Picture Roll.

12 Pictures, wall size, **7/6** net. By post **8**/-.

The Children's Pictures.

13 Cards in pkt., **2½**d. net. By post **1**d. extra. By post 1d. extra on 4 pkts.

The National Sunday School Union
57 & 59 Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.4

INCURABLE.

¶ Men and Women of the **Middle Class** are daily incapacitated by incurable disease brought on by innumerable causes, such as over-work, worry, anxiety, accidents, etc., etc.

¶ Such sufferers have been the care and concern of this Institution for the past sixty-eight years.

¶ There are 103 patients in the Home and Hospital at Streatham. The number of pensioners each receiving £26 a year is 311.

¶ Increased funds are urgently needed. Will you not help in this work of mercy ? It is for a most deserving class—for those who have lost their all in fruitless efforts to regain health and retain independence.

Contributions will be gratefully acknowledged by EDGAR PENMAN, Secretary.

Temporary office address during rebuilding :

90 & 91, QUEEN ST., LONDON, E.C. 4.

British Home and Hospital for Incurables.

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

A PAGE	... ...	£3 3 0
HALF PAGE	... ...	1 11 6
QUARTER PAGE	...	1 0 0

Special Positions.

A PAGE	... ...	£4 4 0
HALF PAGE	... ...	2 2 0
QUARTER PAGE	...	1 5 0

T. M. BRINDLEY,

Advertising Manager,

21 IMPERIAL BUILDINGS, LUDGATE CIRCUS, E.C. 4.

Telephone : City 5613.

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

THE proposals for re-union in South India have given rise to much anxious thought in this country. No Congregationalist, at any rate, wishes to interfere with the liberty of the South Indian Churches, and their undoubted right to control their own affairs. But when vital issues which affect the whole of Christendom are under discussion, it would be wrong to keep silent. So far as can be gathered, British Methodists are in favour of the proposals, and so are many Anglicans. Criticism, in the main, comes from Anglo-Catholics, on the one side, and Congregationalists, on the other, though there are Congregationalists, and notably some honoured for their work in India, who support the scheme of union. The Baptists have been strangely silent, but they probably wonder, with us, why some Congregationalists seem so anxious to conciliate those who hold sacerdotal views about the Church and the ministry, and are so unmindful of the denomination that shares the Congregational witness!

We are told that there is no ambiguity in the South India proposals, that, while Anglicans and Congregationalists with diverse (if not contradictory) views of the ministry and sacraments are to join the United Church, they are to acknowledge their differences—there will be comprehension, not ambiguity. This kind of argument makes not the slightest appeal to us. It means that union is to be apparent and not real, a cloak to screen from the "untutored mind" of the "poor Indian" the radical divisions that exist. It secures no more real unity of spirit than exists to-day, and the pretence means loss rather than gain. This kind of lack of reality is driving people from organized religion by the thousand, and while it persists they will continue to depart. There can be no real union between diametrically opposite views, and we do our best work for the Kingdom of God by maintaining our own witness. Take recent pronouncements of two of the Anglican protagonists of the scheme, both of them to be held in highest honour for their life and work. Bishop Palmer, of Bombay, writes in the *Church Times* of 15th November:

> In the early stages of the discussions of the South Indian Union Scheme, an apprehension was expressed in your pages that some of the ministers of the South India United Church or the Wesleyans who are now working in South India are not baptized, and that consequently unbaptized persons might be among those who under the Scheme would continue to act as ministers of the Word and Sacraments in the Church after the Union. Knowing, as I do, the importance attached to baptism by the great missions in India, and by Indian Christians, I felt morally certain that this apprehension was groundless. However, I thought that the only way to allay such apprehension was by ascertained facts.

48068
1930

> Accordingly, I wrote to South India asking that the facts about all existing ministers might be investigated and sent to me. The Bishop of Dornakal in response to my request wrote to representatives of each mission and district, and forwarded me the answers as he received them. His inquiries are now complete. In sending the last batch, he sums up the results of these inquiries: "It is clear now that you can assert without the slightest doubt that in all these Churches in India care is taken to find out that no one who is not duly baptized becomes a communicant member of the Church, and no one who is neither baptized nor a communicant is ever proposed for ordination." The replies which the Bishop has forwarded to me prove abundantly that no one is ever ordained who is not both baptized and a communicant.

And the Bishop of Dornakal himself, in an article on "Living Forces behind Mass Movements" in the October *International Review of Missions* is characteristically candid. He tells us that to Indian converts "the grace received" at baptism is "as real as to St. Cyprian", and goes on:

> Participation in daily prayer and worship, regular instruction in the Christian faith, constant recital in song and lyric, education of the young, the practical exemplification of the doctrine in the lives of the teacher and his wife, monthly visits from the pastor for inspiration and advice, and most of all, the cleansing waters of baptism and the receiving and laying on of hands in confirmation—these do their work in the hearts and upon the minds and even the physical features of the converts.

Most of all! More than prayer, worship, instruction, education, example—the "cleansing waters of baptism"! To the two bishops the Church is a visible institution which can be entered only in one way, baptism: it has its officers, and they alone can perform the sacraments.

It is that mechanical conception of the Church that we cannot share, and against which we must continue to protest as unreal, uncatholic, unscriptural, and harmful. If Indian Congregationalists think that by joining a United Church with those who hold such conceptions they can best do their work and make their witness, by all means let them do so, and may God's blessing be with them. But their action must not be taken to commit other Congregationalists.

We may be asked whether we have not sufficient confidence in the virility of the Congregational witness to believe that it will survive if for thirty years it lives in association with other views of the Church. We believe that the Congregational conception of the Church is inevitable and indestructible, that so long as Christ's name is proclaimed, so long in every land will groups of His people gather together for worship, fellowship, and service—true churches, though they may have neither ministers, nor sacraments, nor "consecrated buildings".

Our business has always been to stress life rather than organization. Institutionalism has stifled Christianity many a time ere this

and whenever religion has evolved a vast and powerful organization it has been necessary for people like ourselves to break the shell and preserve spontaneity and life. Let us not forget the pit from which we were digged: when there are mighty forces emphasizing the value of the institution and the organization, there is all the more need for our witness to the life.

If we ourselves had ever to choose between a great institution—say a United Church, with a credal basis and with a conception of the ministry and sacraments like that which, starting from South India, the Bishops hope to make "dominant over the whole field", on the one hand, and a group of Christians, without creeds, without ministry, without sacraments, on the other, we should choose the group as simpler, more natural, nearer to the mind of Christ, and the more effective instrument for doing His work.

* * *

Meanwhile it is clear that those in other Churches have a right to ask Congregationalists to be more explicit in regard to some of their views. There is room for a book stating the Congregational view of

(1) The Visible Church and Its Relation to the Invisible Church.
(2) The Church Universal and Its Local Expression.
(3) Ordination.

Many Congregationalists have never thought through their theory, and they and others would be grateful for scholarly guidance. Could Dr. Powicke help?

* * *

THE Congregational Union's Autumn Assembly at Norwich was monopolized by the subject of "Christianity and War." The speeches on the subject delivered at the morning sessions have now been reprinted (Independent Press, 1/-), and those unable to accept Norwich hospitality—rarely have autumnal meetings been so efficiently managed—will be glad to read them. At the end of the week we did not seem much nearer the solution of the problem—though Mr. B. L. Manning had driven a few of his hearers into pacifism, and the Rev. Leyton Richards had offered compensation by making some pacifists very dubious about their position! We are left with the conviction that in our determination to end war we must all go the way our consciences direct, and cease this eternal wrangle. If we believe the Quaker attitude is right we must follow it, without attempting to flog our fellow Christians into walking our way. If we believe that in an unrighteous world a nation must sometimes resort to sub-Christian methods to conserve moral values, we must bear our witness and make our sacrifice—with regret and without any feeling of superiority. Meanwhile we must all be backing with every ounce of energy every effort made by statesmen to secure, by disarmament and in other ways, peace and international goodwill.

N.B. *Lost. A Bell.* Used to be heard at the Assembly of the Congregational Union, in days when speakers kept to the time allotted. The rank and file of the Assembly will give an ample reward to the finder. Secretaries of the Congregational Union not eligible.

* * *

THE appearance of *A Free Church Book of Common Prayer* (Dent, 3s. 6d.) affords the opportunity to mention a feature of Free Church worship which is becoming more and more common—the habit of reading at least some of the prayers. One need not be intolerant about the use of a liturgy to see the dangers that lie in the frequent publication of these books of prayers—in the minister's vestry where these words are being written there are about twenty of them, all published in recent years. The enormous difficulty of public prayer, the natural laziness of the human animal, and the presence of these compilations, all tend in the same direction—we are tempted to combine the proverbs, "Satan finds some mischief still . . . " and "The sight of means to do ill deeds makes ill deeds done" !

It is admitted on all sides that we need more variety in public worship — more silence, and more intercessory prayer, especially prayer in which the congregation shares. The Free Churches would benefit, too, did more of their people know some of the beautiful collects of the Anglican Book. And there may be times and seasons when a printed order of service is a great advantage. But when all has been said Free Churchmen know that " free prayer " is their *métier*—we heard a group of ministers speaking heart to heart the other day, and all confessed that when they read prayers they instinctively felt, "This is not the right thing". When more and more of the men entering the ministry seem to fly to some book or other on every occasion for prayer, and when fewer and fewer of the people in the pews seem ready to pray in public, a word of warning may not be out of place.

This new Prayer Book, we are told, is the result of many years' labour and experiment. We believe it is largely the work of the Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas, and do not see why he should not say so. It contains Orders for ordinary services, the seasons of the Christian year, and the ordinances of the Church, an anthology of prayers for public and private use, and a psalter. There is much that is good and beautiful, but much, too, that is alien to Free Church *ethos*, and some phrases about enemies that we should prefer to see omitted. In the Holy Communion Order we are pleased to note that the answer of forgiveness to the minister's confession of sin is given by the people before the people confess in turn. This is one of the really Evangelical notes about a book which makes us wonder if anybody who wishes has a right to publish a book and label it " Free Church."

* * *

THE Government's stock has fallen a little during the quarter, and it may easily continue to do so. The outlines of its policy deserve the strongest support, but the test comes when the policy is to be worked out. Free Churchmen desire to do all they can to back all disarmament efforts, and are eager to learn what can be done to support the forthcoming Five-Power Naval Conference. Can the Government turn into actual proposals the friendly sentiments between America and England? Its enthusiastic supporters claim that this has already been done, but we prefer to await the outcome when the "realist" outlook of France has found full expression—there is a good deal of Clemenceau in France still!

In the same way we welcome the raising of the school leaving age to fifteen. This is excellent, and we want to help all we can. But what is the Government going to do with recalcitrant and apathetic Local Authorities that are making and intend to make no effort to be ready on the appointed day?

For paper plans of disarmament we want to see actual reductions of estimates; for paper plans of educational progress we want to see schools; and certainly for Mr. Thomas's speeches we want to see employment. It may be that the Lord Privy Seal is being asked to perform the impossible, but as yet there is little visible result of his efforts. We do not want to be impatient, and we are sure Free Churchmen in general are sympathetic toward the Government, but they will not be satisfied with talk any more than will Mr. Maxton and his group.

* * *

ONE of the most delightful books of the quarter is Mr. J. Lewis May's *Cardinal Newman* (Bles, 10s. 6d.). No English Roman Catholic has had anything like Newman's influence over Free Churchmen, and there are hundreds of manses where men take delight in the matchless music of his words. Mr. May's study is perhaps a little too much of a panegyric, but it does convey to the reader Newman's great charm, under the spell of which Mr. May shows himself to be on every page. At times as we read, however, we long for something in the nature of a verdict—a little of the temper, the judicial severity, of Hallam. Mr. May tries to be kind even to Manning; but is it possible for anyone nowadays to think of Manning except as the schemer *par excellence?*

Manning, of course, English Roman Catholics would like to forget, especially since the publication of Purcell's *Life*. It is amusing to find how Purcell still gets on the nerves of Roman Catholics. Mr. Denis Gwynn's biography, *Cardinal Wiseman* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.)—a compact and useful sketch of one largely overshadowed in his own time and since by the converts, Manning and Newman—devotes much of its Introduction to show that Wilfrid Ward's massive biography of Wiseman was so correct and discreet

because of Purcell's "blatant indiscretion in publishing every letter without regard to public scandal or to the feelings of Manning's colleagues who still survived".

The trouble, of course, is that even Roman Catholics have to admit, as Mr. Gwynn does, that Purcell's *Manning* is an "indispensable record": and the letters Manning wrote and received have been shown to the light of day and cannot be blotted out. Scheming, wire-pulling, whispering in the ear of the Vicar of Christ—there it all is for Protestants and all the world to read. Once more we say that we know of nothing better to give to young people attracted by the size and glamour of the Roman Catholic Church than the second volume of Purcell's *Manning*.

While writing of Roman Catholics we are reminded that the other day we heard repeated once more—though the debt to Macaulay was not acknowledged—the statement that Roman Catholicism had always shown remarkable skill in using its converts, in making the enthusiast a champion. Macaulay, of course, had Loyola mostly in mind, and he contrasted the Papal treatment of the founder of the Jesuits with the Church of England's treatment of Wesley. But *has* the Roman Catholic Church been uniformly successful in this regard? Is not Newman an outstanding example to the contrary? What he might have done for Roman Catholicism at Oxford, or even in the Dublin University he projected, he would be a bold man who would dare to say. But every proposal of his for usefulness was pigeon-holed; it was not the wisdom of the Roman Catholic Church but the blundering earnestness of Charles Kingsley that gave Newman his supreme opportunity of service to the Church into which he had been received.

* * *

Mr. J. L. May, in the study of Newman just mentioned, paints an interesting picture of the English Church:

> The Church of England may be likened to a ship freighted on one side with a Catholic, on the other, with a Protestant cargo. So long as the rope of Parliamentary control succeeds in forcibly holding these warring elements together the vessel continues on an even keel. When it relaxes, she takes on an ominous list, or rather proceeds with alarming lurches,
>
> 'Rolling now to starboard, now to larboard',
>
> according as one element in the shifting cargo temporarily outweighs the other. Some there are who would endeavour to keep the vessel afloat, in spite of the inconvenience arising from this chronic discord, because, after all, she is roomy and well victualled. Others are for scuttling the ship and launching the boats, in hopes of making port over the inhospitable sea of Disestablishment.

It has been disappointing to see "Modern Churchmen", whom we should have thought would love to commit themselves to the stormy sea, preferring the roomy and well-victualled ship. How minds so

acute as the Rev. J. S. Bezzant's, for example, are blind to all the advantages to religion to be gained by severing the State connexion we can never understand. But Mr. Bezzant, so far from seeing these, believes that "the certain and immediate consequences (of Disestablishment) would be disastrous", and he goes on: "Nor are modern Nonconformists eager to see such a weakening of the forces of religion as would follow Disestablishment". This frankly astounds us, for we have never met a single Nonconformist who agrees with the Vice-President of Ripon Hall in thinking Disestablishment would "weaken the forces of religion".

And, really, from "Modern Churchmen" we expected something better than the cheap superiority of the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, whose writings generally are so full of sound commonsense. We quote from his address at the last Conference—the italics are ours:

> Mr. Spurgeon is said to have announced to a crowded congregation that his own Church (*I believe it was the Baptist*) . . .

If Mr. Fawkes does not know that Spurgeon was a Baptist he has no right to be addressing a Conference of "Modern Churchmen" or anybody else! If he knows quite well, we appreciate neither his humour nor his taste!

* * *

In no realm is the failure of institutional religion more obvious than in that of preaching. Anthony Trollope, who had been taken to Exeter Hall, described the sermons as "in their nature odious and so tedious that human nature cannot listen"—this reminds us of Keats's "the sermon's horrid sound"—and went on to thunder the verdict, "There is perhaps no greater hardship at present inflicted on mankind in civilized and free countries than the necessity of listening to sermons". No longer can that be said, at any rate! Most people stay away from sermons altogether, and switch off the wireless when the time for worship comes.

But is it not true to say that those who do listen to sermons have to endure many preached just because it is the custom to preach two sermons every Sunday and not because the preacher has something on his heart to say? How rarely we get a sermon *non atramento scripta sed ipsius viri sanguine!* But when we do we have real preaching, and soul speaks to soul. Let a man who has been tempted tell of his struggles and the way he won through to victory, and human beings in like case will listen and thank God for him. Let a man who has passed through the deep waters of sorrow speak from his heart of the place where he found comfort and peace, and lonely folks will say "This man knows", and be of good cheer. Speaking of that "amazing genius," Tertullian, in his latest book, Dr. T. R. Glover says: "What power of phrase! And how much of his power does he owe to the fact that he had something extremely real to say that called out all his gifts."

If books ceased to be written and sermons ceased to be preached except when people had something vital to say, how much better it would be for the world! But some preachers discuss God as if He were an algebraical formula, and human poverty and suffering as if it were a chess problem. Naturally people stay away, or are bored and listless, and go out even as they came in. If Christianity is to win the world it will be *non tali auxilio*.

* * *

We have read somewhere that when Mr. Gladstone presented the name of James Bryce to Queen Victoria for a post in one of his Ministries, the dear soul had never heard of the author of *The Holy Roman Empire* and the Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford. An even more surprising lack of knowledge has lately been revealed. In *The Indian Ferment* Mr. H. G. Alexander tells of a visit to Java and an interview with the Governor General, and goes on:

> He knew of Woodbrooke and said it had a high reputation in Holland, intimating that he shared that opinion. I could not help being amused at the thought that this Dutch statesman, ruler of this great Eastern empire, knew of Woodbrooke, while Sir Austen Chamberlain, the lifelong inhabitant of Birmingham, when I saw him last year had never heard of the place.

It is one of the amazing things of life that a man who bestrides the narrow world of his own interests like a Colossus is utterly unknown to people in an adjacent sphere. Probably Mr. Edgar Wallace has never heard of Dr. J. D. Jones, and the President of the Free Church Council does not know who Wilfred Rhodes is. A man who is controlling millions of pounds could not tell whether Gilbert Murray is a half-back or a mathematical physicist, while the Civil Servant in charge of a vast area in India would be hard put to it to say to which Church Dr. William Temple belongs. We still live very much in water-tight compartments, despite the spread of education, the improved means of transit, the wireless, and all other elements of our modern civilization.

* * *

Binding Cases for Vol. VII of *The Quarterly* may be had from the publishers, the price being 2s. (including index and title page, which may be had separately for 3d.) A few bound copies of the whole volume are available, price 12s. 6d.

THE CHURCH'S FAILURE.

THE "Church," which is Christianity organized, is popularly supposed to have failed. Some hold it in contempt; others extend to it their pity. No one has a good word for it and even its most stalwart defenders appear anxious either to recover something it formerly possessed or to discard what it now possesses; thereby expressing their sense of dissatisfaction with its present form. From simple elementary beginnings it has evolved into a complicated organism the several members of which do not habitually work together with perfect ease. On the whole, its development has been slow. Nor can it be denied that, whatever its shortcomings, it is very tenacious of life—most of all when that life is threatened by persecution. Whether it be counted a failure or not, however, depends firstly upon what the Church ought to be, and secondly upon what the Church ought to do. It is necessary therefore to agree upon some common understanding of the Church's aim and function, although a more accurate theological definition of *ecclesia,* of which the English word "Church" is a translation, may for the time being be postponed, together with any discussion as to which of the different Christian sects and denominations may claim to be the true "Church." It will be sufficient to consider the matter from a practical point of view and take the facts as they are.

The first question that arises is as to whether Christianity ought to be organized at all. There are those who believe that religion can express itself more adequately through the lives of individuals, without any attempt being made to relate those lives to one another. So long as men act towards one another in a Christian way, what need is there to give corporate shape to their beliefs? The true Church must always be invisible, because Christianity is a matter of the spirit, not of the letter; and only God can know who is sincerely following the way of Christ, and who is making pretence. No tests that human ingenuity can devise can separate the tares from the wheat; both must grow together until the harvest. Surely, therefore, organization, which is bound to be imperfect, is unnecessary. Moreover, whether Jesus anticipated that a Church would come into being after His death or not, He certainly paid little attention to its formation and had no concern as to its doctrine or discipline.

These arguments sound convincing. Yet when examined they are open to serious objection. Even if it be true that Christianity is communicated through individuals and is primarily a matter of individual loyalty, yet it is surely desirable for men and women who are striving for the realization of a common purpose and are moving towards a common objective, to come together in some form of co-operative activity. Unity is strength, especially when cemented

by love, as Christian unity ought to be. Moreover, Christianity, though individual, is not individualistic: it is fellowship, both with God and with men. If a man is not prepared to associate himself with others who love Jesus he cannot justly be called a Christian. It is not prejudice or bigotry or narrowness that prompts this statement, but plain historical facts which no reader of the New Testament can dispute, for if one quality of primitive Christianity is more conspicuous than another it is the element of fellowship; and if this be extracted from the Christian religion, what is left is not Christianity. It may be true that Jesus did not define the Church, nor take steps to build up its organization. But He constituted a fellowship in creating the Apostolic group; and there is every reason to believe that He earnestly desired its continuance after His death. This group was not an *ad hoc* committee which could be disbanded when its work was done; it was a permanent commission, entrusted with power which gave it coherence, authority, and stability.

Some attempt to perpetuate His spirit in an organized fellowship might indeed have been anticipated from the teaching of Jesus. For example, He told His disciples to love their enemies, and suggested that this was one of the ways in which they were to be distinguished; it was to be the mark of their allegiance to Him. But how is it possible to love our enemies, unless we learn to love our friends? There is a growing tendency to wax sentimental over our national enemies; we do not meet them face to face; we do not associate with them in the ordinary affairs of every-day life; they are a long way off; therefore it seems comparatively easy to think kindly of them. But the real test of our Christianity is not in sentimentalizing over those we never meet, but in trying to get on with those nearest to us, into whose company we are thrown by circumstances, and with whose ideals we have something in common.

If a man says he is not a Christian and therefore has no sympathy with organized Christianity, his position is reasonable; but if he says he is a Christian, and refuses to associate with professing Christians on the ground that he does not like their manners or their conversation, his position is not reasonable, and cannot be justified either in logic or in morals. If he refuses to give his allegiance to the Church because in his opinion the Church is unchristian or only partly Christian, he is taking up an attitude which, even if justified by facts, is not Christian in its temper; for surely his duty is to use his influence to raise the standards of spiritual life within the Church rather than set himself in opposition to it.

Some kind of fellowship, therefore, is essential to the practice of the Christian religion; and if it is to be a living fellowship it must organize itself; for all life expresses itself through organization, and the more efficient the organization the more healthy the life. A flower is organized beauty; music is organized sound; science is organized

ruth. A human body, which is one of the most perfect instruments n existence, is organized mind; it functions at the bidding of mind until it is no longer required, when it falls into decay. It was not for nothing that Paul spoke of the Church as the *Body* of Christ. No illustration is more apt; no definition more precise. It may be said, therefore, that the Church is an organization intended to express the mind of Christ through a spirit of fellowship—for fellowship is essential to any religion associated with the name of Jesus of Nazareth. The existence of the Church is justified on the ground that without organization no fellowship could function. It may be urged that the machinery of the Church is not adequate to its task. That is a matter for discussion; but we are not at liberty even to say this until we are clear as to what the task of the Church should be. This must therefore be the next consideration.

If fellowship be regarded as essential to the Christian religion, it becomes necessary to enquire what form it should take. Patience is required here, because the issue is so often confused by hasty and ill-considered generalizations. In brief, it may be suggested that in the constitution of a Christian fellowship three elements are involved, which may be summed up as worship, dogma, and propaganda. Worship must be put first because the most important aspect of Christianity is fellowship with God. It may be admitted that it is possible to have fellowship with God in many ways not connected with organized Church services. Alone in his private room; enjoying the beauties of nature whilst on a walk in a country lane; even in the crowded streets of a great city, it is possible for a man to commune with God. But worship in association with others will lift him out of himself and make him less likely to concentrate on his own individual needs and necessities; and these, even if purely spiritual, if given too much attention may tend to make him not only self-centred but selfish. In corporate devotion, too, the elements of praise and adoration, which constitute the highest form of worship, find more adequate expression. When we pray together we are less likely to pray for ourselves and more likely to pray for one another. Nothing brings men nearer to one another than shared communion with God. It deepens and strengthens human friendship. When we meet over a game of cards or a cup of coffee we may be said to be friendly. When we meet in the deep things of the spirit we may be said to be friends. Worship, therefore, is one of the essential elements of Christian fellowship; and though the element of spontaneity ought not to be excluded, yet the kind of worship most likely to be spiritually effective is generally one which is thought out, arranged, prepared for, and made as beautiful and complete as possible; in a word, it must be organized.

Christian fellowship also involves dogma. This is a harsh word and falls strangely on modern ears. But properly understood,

dogmatic religion is democratic religion; for a dogma is the formal pronouncement, not of one man acting on his own initiative, but of the whole Church. It is the expression of what is generally held and accepted by Christian people everywhere. There are some dogmas which have been outgrown; though they are fewer than is generally supposed. Yet even in instances of dogmatic decrepitude some truth can always be found at their heart, which it may be needs but to be understood and given fresh expression to be intelligible. After all, it is surely of value to put into words, as clearly and concisely as possible, what has been the belief of Christians through all the centuries, and to give to that truth the authority of the Church as a whole. The essential facts of religion need to be guarded from mistake, misunderstanding, and abuse. Dogma is one amongst other methods whereby these ends can be secured; and it possesses the double advantage of preserving the Christian thought and experience of the past and presenting it to the world in a manner that is explicit. As individuals, Christians may be able to give an account of their beliefs; but this is not sufficient. Some general statement which sums up what is commonly considered to be fundamental to the faith, is essential to presenting Christianity to a world which rightly demands to know precisely where the Church stands in regard to its own doctrine.

It may be said that the disadvantage of dogma consists in binding the thought of the present by the experience of the past, and laying upon the spirit of reverent enquiry a dead hand, thus making progress impossible. The answer to this objection is that, although this generation may be better informed than those which preceded it in regard to some matters, we have no evidence to prove that it is more capable of expressing what is the true nature of the Christian religion. On the whole, the fourth and fifth centuries of our era, which constituted the great creed-making age of the Church, in many respects were more intellectual than our own. Certainly the classical Greek language was a better medium for expressing the niceties of philosophical thought than that spoken in any European country to-day. English words like "substance" or "person," for example, are wholly inadequate to set forth, even symbolically, the ideas which the Greeks expressed by *ousia* or *hypostasis*. It is true that a flood of new knowledge is pouring in upon us of which we must take heed. But scientific information cannot supersede historic truth; indeed it cannot supersede any truth, though it may modify its form of expression and give to it new meaning and fresh emphasis. If it be true that Jesus has revealed certain facts about God, then because God is eternal these facts cannot be overthrown; though they may be given greater value. The dogmas of the Church, as expressed in the great catholic creeds, are not meant to fetter the mind or lay burdens upon the intellect, but to assist the individual in his quest for the truth by summing up concretely the great mass of accumulated Christian experience and

defining with sufficient accuracy the main propositions of Christian teaching.

Again, Christian fellowship expresses itself in propaganda; called by some evangelism, by others missionary enterprise. It consists in bearing corporate witness, in each generation as it comes, to the fundamentals of the faith. Christianity is too big and comprehensive to be expressed by one individual, or even, in the divided state of Christendom as it is to-day, by one denomination. In the New Testament the word "church" is used in two senses: (1) a group, however small, gathered together in a particular place; (2) the Church universal. It may be argued, however, that the first use of the term was a temporary expedient, rendered necessary by the circumstances of the time and intended to be superseded by the wider dream of a catholic, that is, a universal, society. In any event, it is not unreasonable to affirm that, taken as a whole and considered in the light of its historical development, the "Church," even as it exists to-day, does in some measure succeed in presenting to the world a very fair picture of the essentials of the Christian faith. It may be that local "churches" with forms of government peculiar to themselves are necessary to the perfecting of the portrait of Jesus; that question may be left open; but it is difficult to believe that denominationalism is desirable as an ideal, for surely a perfect Church would be united not merely in spirit but in form. On the other hand, it must be remembered that each separate denomination came into being in order to emphasize some particular aspect of the truth which was in danger of being overlooked. And with the world as it is to-day, the best service that the denominations can now render is for each to be loyal to its own emphasis. It is folly for the Methodists or the Baptists, for example, to try to gather within their respective folds all God's sheep; they should be content to care for those who are naturally and temperamentally drawn to them; and to recognize that others there may be "not of this fold." Anglicanism or Congregationalism or Presbyterianism has no exclusive title to the word "Church": at best each is but a branch of the Catholic Church of Christ. A few people gathered together in a denominational meeting place are not *The Church* except in the sense that each local group is representative of the whole, just as a single cell contains within its compass the living constituents of the whole organism. So long as the local group recognizes that it is a part of a larger whole and does not seek to unchurch those outside its borders it may claim the rights and privileges belonging to the Church universal. But the moment it becomes exclusive either in form or in temper, it denies the principle of catholicity. The Roman Catholic communion in theory lays claim to be *The Church*; because it is aiming at catholicity and is not prepared to compromise on its fundamental principle that the Church is the body of Christ, which body ought not to be broken. But in

practice it falls short of its own ideals, mistaking rigidity for strength of principle, and reaction for loyalty to truth. Protestantism would have been rendered unnecessary had the Roman Church been really and truly catholic; for Protestantism is in essence a protest against false views of catholicity. At the moment, therefore, the only way to preserve the corporate witness of the Church as a whole is for each section within the Church to remain loyal to its own vision of the truth, though in no exclusive spirit and with the recognition that for a complete witness all other sections are necessary.

The function of the Church, therefore, is to maintain and develop the spirit of fellowship by a corporate worship in which men draw near to God and to one another; by a common statement of belief, so that the great essentials of the faith are clearly stated and firmly adhered to; and by a united witness to the world of the power of God as it is unloosed in human souls by the grace of the living Christ.

This statement is admittedly far from adequate, not only from the standpoint of ecclesiastical theory but from the more mundane point of view of the practical man. He will ask, and rightly—has the Church no message for the world of industry? Has it nothing to say about war? Has it no word of hope or comfort for the masses of people toiling in circles of degradation and depression? The answer to these questions is that if it is true to its mission as the executive agent of the spirit of fellowship it will necessarily mould the life of the day in harmony with the will of God; and all departments of life will come under its influence. God desires all men to live together in holy and happy love, and they can—if they will—achieve this end. But the ideal state of society which these words connote can only be brought into being by the voluntary acceptance of those principles which are exemplified in the life and teaching of Jesus. The function of the Church is to make clear the will of God; to express the mind of Christ. Of course the Church has failed to prevent war. How could it be otherwise when men prefer to govern by principles that are the very opposite of those of the Prince of Peace? Of course the Church has failed to solve the social problem. What else could be expected when men continue to traffic in human lives for greed of gain? The Kingdom of God cannot come by force. God Himself cannot succeed if men fail Him. Having created men free, God has to honour His own work. To do otherwise would be to deny Himself. It is this realization of God's limitation in dealing with persons having power of moral choice that lies behind the dogma of hell, which means quite simply that if man so chooses he can continue to defy God for ever. There is no finer tribute to the dignity of human nature than to say that it has the power to set at nought the beneficent purposes of a good God not only here but hereafter. If the Church attempted to coerce men it would be disloyal to its own principles; and when it has done so in the past it has discovered to its own cost what a fatal

mistake has been made. The Church can persuade, appeal, educate —and that is all. It can support legislation having as its aim the good of the people; but it cannot tyrannize, not even over tyrants. It may be said that hospitals have failed, because men still suffer from disease; that schools have failed because men are still ignorant; that the Church has failed because all the world does not acknowledge Christ. So far this is true; but at whose door does the failure lie? Not at his who is doing his best to defeat disease, ignorance, and sin: but rather at his whose only function is to find fault.

If indeed the Church is to be indicted, it must be on right grounds and for the right reasons. It cannot be blamed because men ignore its message; but it can be blamed for disregarding its proper business. If worship be perfunctory, if preaching be listless, if dogma be disregarded and propaganda ignored, then on the shoulders of the Church a heavy burden rests. Even if the function of organized Christianity were confined to the explanation and interpretation of the great doctrines of the faith much would be accomplished; for Christian doctrine leads to the most serious consequences and carries with it heavy responsibilities. This is not generally recognized, but it is none the less true. For example, the doctrine of the Incarnation has social implications that are very far-reaching; for if God entered into the life of a Galilean carpenter then human nature is precious indeed; all human toil becomes divine, all human life of inestimable worth to God. Here we have a satisfactory basis for something in the nature of a social revolution. So far from hesitating about proclaiming the central dogmas of her religion lest they should offend the modern mind, the Church in the interest of social progress itself ought to shout them from the housetops. The liberation of human bodies and the freedom of human minds are as much a consequence of the Christian faith as the salvation of human souls. The way for the Church to make good her right to existence is to stick to her principles; maintaining her work at the highest degree of spiritual efficiency and allowing nothing in her forms of worship to be ill done or badly expressed. Soon or late the spiritual ideals represented by the fellowship of the Church are bound to win recognition; that is, if those ideals are worthy; and if they are not worthy their doom is certain. This is in accord with the natural law which decrees that all useless things are either destroyed or altered in character. Beauty, truth, and goodness must prevail; the fellowship of love cannot be defeated. The Church is founded upon a rock; if it is true to itself, ultimately it will gather all humanity within its borders; not by force, but by the free and willing co-operation of those whose minds are unclouded by error and whose hearts respond to the appeal of God.

A. Gordon James.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE FALLIBILITY OF JESUS.

In theological and religious matters one dislikes labels. They inevitably involve some promiscuity. Thus it is not everything in "Modernism" I deny, and it is certainly not everything in "Fundamentalism" I applaud. The criticism offered in this paper should be considered by itself and not as a general repudiation of any school of thought. I do not suppose that my own simple beliefs about Christ are orthodox, but the teaching of certain scholars to-day that our Lord was not without error in His religious utterance and that it is doubtful whether He was altogether without sin is, in my judgment, destructive of that faith in Him which the New Testament declares is able to save the soul.

The position as to His religious fallibility has been stated positively enough by Professor Kirsopp Lake in *The Stewardship of Faith*.

> If we go back a little we find that men believed in an infallible Bible, and that belief has been forced from us by the undeniable proof of fallibility. The same may be said of the belief in an infallible Church. But Liberal Protestantism in the nineteenth century thought that historical criticism would remove all the misrepresentations of later tradition and reveal the figure of the historic Jesus as infallible. Is that hope also to go? Yes, I fear so. It is impossible to find its fulfilment in Jesus if he conditioned his teaching by Jewish apocalypticism, and believed in what was, after all, an illusory expectation of the coming of the Kingdom of God.

One notices here a mode of judgment very common in our time, but inherently weak. The presentation of a series of surrenders to criticism is a subtle prejudice. Infallibility may be an error once, twice, but not necessarily in the third instance. Why, then, connect these contentions? The fallibility or infallibility of Jesus—by which, of course, is meant not the question whether He could err but whether He did err—is a matter apart, and Prof. Lake is not justified in seeking the verdict he desires on the strength of other verdicts given in his favour in similar but not identical circumstances.

I do not propose to linger over Prof. Lake's utterance, but I have quoted it for two reasons. In the first place, coming from a distinguished member of the Episcopal Church it shews how little value can be attached to creeds and articles for the safeguarding of the Faith as it is declared in the New Testament. In the second place, taken in conjunction with what follows, it serves as an example of the fact that in Christological thinking our divisions do not run upon ecclesiastical lines. When, therefore, I turn to the similar teaching

of a Congregational scholar it must not be thought that the faultiness of which I complain is in any sense the result of our Church system.

As Congregationalists we may well be proud of Dr. C. J. Cadoux's recent book *Catholicism and Christianity*.[1] It is a fine piece of polemic, at once charitable and learned and acute. The high value attaching to his literary craft, his erudition, and the importance of the position he holds as a trainer of ministers, give a weight to his words such as attaches to the utterances of only a few amongst us. This applies not only to his criticism of Catholicism but to those many pronouncements upon New Testament teaching which are to be found throughout his treatise.

Dealing with the authority of Jesus (c. xi) Dr. Cadoux discusses "certain elements in His recorded words which as they stand seem at first sight to conflict sharply with what on other grounds we firmly believe to be true (p. 212)". Some of these are purely subordinate matters such as the ascription of the Pentateuchal Law to Moses and of *Ps.* 110 to David. There is no real difficulty in either of these, because it is evident that they are matters in which Jesus no more exercised any judgment of His own than an average preacher does to-day about the authorship of *Titus Andronicus* if he quotes from it as Shakespeare. Plainly here is no issue which vitally affects the religious authority of Jesus. More important is the trouble Dr. Cadoux feels about the "unpardonable sin". He has suggested in an earlier work[2] that there may have been in the judgment of Jesus here a lapse from His own better thinking into the sterner mentality of those who had educated Him. In *C. and C.* (p. 526) he hesitates between this view and the quite reasonable suggestion that we have in this case merely an "idiomatic Jewish way of branding" this particular sin as "supremely or uniquely sinful". The difference between these two explanations is that the second conserves the moral infallibility of Jesus as the first does not.[3] The next difficulty in our author's enumeration, the language of vengeance used in the parable of the pounds (*Luke* 19[27]) is surely altogether irrelevant, seeing that this is part of a parable and cannot be pressed into meaning more than a grave warning to those who resisted the Spirit of God manifested in Himself.

1 Hereafter quoted as *C and C.*

2 *The Guidance of Jesus for To-day,* 36.

3 For those to whom this utterance of Jesus is a real trouble I commend the illuminating note on God's Forgiveness in the late Dr. I. Abrahams's *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*: first series, 139, ff. " It will be noticed, *e.g.,* that the Confession of Sins on the Day of Atonement—a confession older according to Dr. Rendel Harris than the *Didache*—includes offences of the most varied kind, including breaches of the Decalogue and also those sins ('profanation of the name' and so forth) which in the theoretic theology were pronounced unpardonable. Yet after enumerating them the worshipper adds :—" For all these, O God of forgiveness, forgive us, pardon us, grant us remission." A certain tendency to hyperbole and to extreme expression in the concrete often attaches to Hebrew teaching. The precision of science is the very last thing to expect in the Jewish mind of long ago, or in the mind of Jesus.

Then in Dr. Cadoux's list of difficulties we come to the belief of Jesus in demon possession and exorcism, Satan, and the angels. Are these matters really an offence to any one, unless it be the man who holds so homocentric a creed as to think the universe empty of all rational life other than that of living men? What if Jesus did believe in demons and angels? Who is in the position to say He erred? When next Dr. Cadoux includes "traces of determinism" in the teaching of the Gospels as an objection to belief in our Lord's infallibility one is almost driven to regard him as a special pleader, bent upon denying that high claim, rather than a serious investigator of what Jesus actually taught. Our concern surely is with facts. "Traces" are too hypothetic and too subjectively connected to enter into so tremendous a discussion. It is only fair to say that the Professor does no more than state this particular difficulty and hastens to concentrate upon what we must all feel to be a far more vital concern—"much of the eschatology: Gehenna-fire, and the retention of the earthly body with its limbs in the next life (*Mt.* 5^{29f}, *etc.*): 'eternal punishment' (*Mt.* 25^{46}): the prophecy that Jesus will return on the clouds *within the space of one generation*[1] (*Mk.* 9^{1}, *etc.*)".

Before examining these points in any detail I make one general criticism. With great respect I am frequently amazed at the literalistic tendency in Dr. Cadoux's writings, a quality which leads him to re-name for us most of the familiar people of antiquity, so that Origen becomes *Origines* and Jerome *Hieronymus* whilst the *Epistle of James* becomes the *Epistle of Jacob*, though, happily if inconsistently, Paul remains Paul. The same curiously strained thinking yields for him an illustration of the limitation of our Lord's knowledge in the familiar story of the woman with the issue of blood, for "delicacy would presumably have withheld Him from asking" (Who touched me?) had He known what was really the matter with her (p. 215). Is any comment needed upon such an extraordinary reading back of Western conventional refinements into Eastern life twenty centuries ago? I am compelled to ask whether Professor Cadoux does not suffer from some severe disability through the very meticulousness of his intellectual labours. One remembers the bold but broadly true saying of Matthew Arnold in his essay *On Translating Homer*:

> To handle these matters properly there is needed a poise so perfect, that the least overweight in any direction tends to destroy the balance. Temper destroys it, a crotchet destroys it, *even erudition may destroy it.*

I expose myself to a retort by my italics but, with honest humility and a keen desire to learn from Dr. Cadoux, I am often left wondering whether he approximates to that perfect poise which Arnold so

[1] Italics are the author's.

rightly desiderated for the interpretation of an ancient literature. Thus, who would have thought, unless it were a man of unmastered erudition, that Jesus really believed in the "retention of the earthly body with its limbs in the next life"[1]? There is a Jewish canon which declares, "Whosoever translates a verse of scripture according to its outward form is a liar"[2]—a most admirable canon since it illustrates by its very form the precious truth it expresses. As to "eternal punishment" Dr. Cadoux has himself treated the subject so sensibly that he makes his rejection of the infallibility of Jesus on this score the more gratuitous by adding at the end of his discussion that inasmuch as Jesus derived from His contemporaries many beliefs now untenable, He may have done so in this case also and really have believed that punishment would last for ever (pp. 526-7). Yet it is one of the heaviest items in Dr. Cadoux's indictment of Romanism that it holds to the same terrible doctrine! Why, if any alternative is possible, should he entertain the opinion that Jesus held a belief he himself repudiates as "not only intellectually incredible, but morally outrageous (p. 547)"?

If the Professor does no more than consider this a possible interpretation of the intellectual and moral character of Jesus' thinking about future punishment, he is more sure that Jesus was mistaken in His prophecy that He Himself would return "on the clouds within the space of one generation". Now we approach the heart of our differences. Dr. Cadoux has honoured me with a reference (p. 214) to a contribution I made to the discussion of this subject,[3] only to question the interpretation for which I have pleaded more than once. My contention was that the language of Jesus here, as so often elsewhere, was poetical and symbolic. I could not expect in so comprehensive a work as *C. and C.* that the author should discuss the evidence supporting my argument. I am told, however, that we do not apply the poetic interpretation to Jewish apocalyptics generally and therefore must not do so in the case of Jesus. Dr. Cadoux is surely very wide of the mark. We do not, indeed, exempt these Jewish writers from "inaccuracy", but when language like "coming on the clouds" is used we do, as a matter of fact, realize that such phrases are symbolic and not literal. There surely can be no doubt as to the poetic quality of the Jewish mind contemporary with Christ as exhibited, *e.g.*, in *I Enoch*. Dr. Charles speaks of the authors of this Apocalypse as "enthusiasts and mystics" who reveal "on occasions the inspiration of the Old Testament Prophets[4]". And again: "In the age to which the Enoch literature

1 In a later footnote the author seems to modify his difficulty (*C. and C.*, 525).
2 Abbott's *The Fourfold Gospel* (Sect. II, p. XXII).
3 *Congregational Quarterly, V.* 254,ff.
4 *Apoc. and Pseud. of the O.T.*, II. 163.

belongs there is movement everywhere, and nowhere dogmatic fixity and finality". It is significant also, as Dr. Charles has shewn, that "no small proportion of it (*Enoch*) was written originally in verse[1]". Movement, "no dogmatic fixity or finality", is indeed of the essence of poetry whether there be verse-form or not. And the dream-visions of *Enoch,* the brilliantly imaginative descriptions of the heavenly world (particularly in cc. 14-18) can never have been intended in a photographic sense. It is specially noteworthy that the clouds of heaven are repeatedly treated with spiritual suggestiveness. We read of the "spirit of the mist[2]". And again, "Behold, in the vision clouds invited me, and a mist summoned me[3]". *Enoch* is full of the doctrine of the Immanence of God in the form of angelic presences identified with natural things[4]. Associated with this poetic treatment of nature and transparent symbolism is the strong ethical purpose which makes the whole work worthy of our respect. The authors were mystics with a moral aim, and, from c. 92 onwards, their language becomes increasingly outspoken in condemnation of political bullying, cruelty, sensuality, and all selfishness.

Now whilst firmly claiming for Jesus at least the creative quality of genius, and refusing, therefore, to force His utterances into anything like a standardized Apocalyptic, the evidence—a very little out of much—we have just surveyed should certainly guard us against literalizing His utterances upon these tremendous themes. Moreover, in His case we are dealing with one whose teaching is often expressed in the traditional forms of Hebrew verse. The late Professor Burney, in his invaluable treatise, *The Poetry of Our Lord* has clearly demonstrated the fact that a great deal of the teaching in all four Gospels is expressed in the well known forms of Hebrew rhythm and parallelism[5]. He has also shewn that when translated back from the Greek to the Aramaic in which Jesus usually spoke, not only is the language rhythmical with clearly marked stresses but that in some instances—*e.g.*, the Lord's Prayer, the Beatitudes (except the last) and the parable of the sheep and the goats in *Mt.* 25—it falls quite naturally into rhyme. Dr. Burney considered that there may have been a mnemonic purpose in this. With due respect I suggest that there was no conscious purpose at all, but a rush of feeling such as generally characterized the typical Hebrew poet. Caught up in the full tide of that creative energy which is revealed to us in the order and balance and exquisite correspondences of Nature, His song inevitably received therefrom its swing and

1 *Ibid,* 171.

2 *Enoch* 60^{19}; *cf. Jubilees* 22.

3 *Enoch* 14^{8}; *cf.* also 100^{11}.

4 *Cf., e.g.,* 69^{22-24}.

5 From the Jewish side this, in the main, is accepted by Mr. Montefiore in *The Synoptic Gospels.*

assonance. He went through Galilee chanting His wisdom and making music of the Glad Tidings because of the joy of God that was in Him. And when the sorrowful days came and the end was near, the quality of His mind would not alter, only instead of the ballad of the Lord's Prayer came the storm-language of Apocalyptic odes, like the overture of Tannhäuser reaching through terrific conflict the victory of the initial theme. Now Hebrew poetry resembles our modern "free verse" in one respect: it can subside easily into prose. Conversely prose, conversation even, when emotional, easily rises into poetic expression. Thus isolated sayings like the reply of Jesus to the challenge of the high priest at His trial may be coloured by the poetic habit. In no other way than by poetic interpretation is it possible to understand how Jesus could speak of His presence or return, not only as Dr. Cadoux says *within the space of one generation,* but from the very moment of His rejection by His judges[1].

The interpretation which maintains that Jesus expected a universal physical cataclysm—stars falling (where?) and His own appearance in clouds, and angelic bands classifying men, *etc.*—within the lifetime of the apostles, or indeed at any time, involves the grave conclusion that He misled His disciples and subjected their religious life to a prolonged and most unhealthy delusion. The question for them was a religious question of capital importance, for no one could consider that the Parousia would be an event out of relation to moral forces or to the will of God. The very word that is used about its provenance— *συντέλεια* (consummation)—proves the contrary. It is quite true that as to the form of the Parousia the apostles at first failed to understand His mind. But their failure was not confined to this subject alone. They were a long time in understanding how He had made all meats clean, or how He claimed all the world for the Gospel seed. But at last they did put aside that literal interpretation of the Parousia which some of our Modernists would force upon His words. This is evident from Paul's later epistles and from the Fourth Gospel. Did they in this surpass their teacher, being made wise by events or by the lack of events, or was it that at last they understood His true mind?

For ourselves, even as for them, the question cannot be regarded as a purely intellectual one. In view of all that is said about the interim character of our Lord's ethical teaching how can it be contended that His precipitate expectations of cataclysm do not qualify His ethical authority? Dr. Herrmann and others have shewn

1 Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven (*R.V.*) *Henceforth,* ἀπ' ἄρτι (*Mt.* 26[64]), ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (*Luke* 22[69]). For a recent confirmation of this rendering see Canon Bindley in *Expository Times,* Sept., 1929.

plausibly enough that such a maxim as *Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth* assumes a much more practicable character if the earth was about to be destroyed[1].

Still more must these alleged errors affect His religious authority. For if they are real errors they reveal a judgment which in the very measure of its confidence disclosed its separation from the counsels of God. Nor can we lose sight of that confident note which is never so strong as in its announcement of the Parousia. *Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away* (*Mark* 13[31]). That is to say He knew He was not mistaken. Yet Dr. Cadoux says He was. Which of the two is likely to be right? If we follow Dr. Cadoux then I fear we must seriously discount all the other emphases of Jesus. Indeed, what had always before seemed a Divine self-sufficiency in Him becomes now suspect as just a fanatical warp of egotism bordering upon insanity.

Let us face facts. One of the amazing things to those of us who stand outside the high circles of scholarship and claim no more than to be students of the New Testament is the blindness or indifference of some great scholars to the consequences of their doctrines. For a considerable time our churches have been bewailing their loss of adherents. Doubtless there are more causes than one to account for depletion. But this at least is clear—the world will never be won into loyalty for a Lord who is shewn to have been a deluded enthusiast, however noble His sincerity and final martyrdom. But it is not Jesus who is at fault. The trouble lies with the mechanized intellect of the West. We have all been far too quick to assent to scientific methods operating in spheres where they had no proper function. We have realized too little the timeless qualities of the mind of our Lord. And we have disallowed Him that newness of thought which belongs to all those who live in close fellowship with the Father.

I turn now to what is a yet more weakening doubt in the Modernist's conception of Jesus. Dr. Cadoux is not sure whether He was without sin; I believe there are not a few in our ministry, as well as in other communions, who are in the same distressing uncertainty.

> Apologists for the creeds confidently assert that Jesus was sinless in the most absolute sense, despite the fact that we know too little of His life or of the psychology of sin to be able to insist dogmatically on sweeping conclusions in regard to such a point, and to build doctrines upon them: nor do they adequately explain why Jesus submitted to a baptism of repentance, or why he objected to being addressed as "Good Master", on the ground that "(there is) none good save one, (namely) God", or why the author of Hebrews described him as "learning obedience by the things that he suffered"[2].

[1] *The Social Gospel*, 177.
[2] *Guidance of Jesus*, 47,f.

Again I am constrained to think that Dr. Cadoux's hermeneutics are governed by his theology, for how otherwise could such poor reasons be given for his conclusion? To begin with the last, learning obedience certainly does not imply prior disobedience. In the very context of the passage quoted (5^{1-10}) there is a contrast drawn between the earthly high priest who needs to offer sacrifices for himself as well as for the sins of the people, and our high priest of whose participation in human sin no such thing is said. And has Dr. Cadoux forgotten those other verses in *Hebrews* (4^{15}, 7^{26}) which definitely assert the sinlessness of Jesus? Moreover other scriptures corroborate here. *Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf* (2 *Cor.* 5^{21}). *Who did no sin neither was guile found in His mouth* (1 *Peter* 2^{22}). *And we know that He was manifested to take away sins; and in Him is no sin* (1 *John* 3^{5}). Two of the passages cited refer to our Lord in His Heavenly exaltation, yet most clearly they pre-suppose the sinlessness of His moral life as the necessary qualification for His Heavenly reign. Are we to set aside the testimony of four distinct types of New Testament scriptures? Was not the Apostolic Church, however mistaken about some matters, at least as competent to judge of this as ourselves?

I come to the next objection, the reply of Jesus to the greeting "Good Master" (*Mark* 10^{18}). Dr. Cadoux is, I suppose, entitled to say that the version in *Mt.* (19^{17}) is a "deliberate alteration", made in the interests of orthodoxy. If it be so it is unfortunate and certainly adds a bad mark to the count against the intelligence of the final editor of the first Gospel. It shews in fact that he shared Dr. Cadoux's failure to appreciate our Lord's mind, but did not share the doctor's truthfulness. The reply of Jesus to the perhaps-glib salutation *Good Master* is quite compatible with our view of His character. That pre-occupation with the glory of the Heavenly World which ever characterized Jesus, that absorption of His spirit in the vision of God which led Him to declare that no one but Himself knew the Father save those whom He admitted to a share in His experience—all this made Him a man Divinely obsessed. Just in the same way He said to His disciples and the multitudes, *Call no man your father on the earth: for one is your Father, which is in Heaven* (*Mt.* 23^{9}). So truly did God fulfil the ideal of Fatherhood that by a paradox it might be said He snatched from men all right to use the word for a human parent. If we are to be as literal as Dr. Cadoux I suppose we should say that Jesus meant no one henceforth was to use this term in its ordinary application. Yet constantly He so used it Himself. This is an exact parallel to the saying *Why callest thou me good, etc.* Beside that awful and all-pervading Goodness out of which had arisen the vast processions of happy, creaturely life, and from which come the many quickening and uplifting motions that draw the pure in heart into the felicity of Heaven,

who could be accounted good? Was this to admit sinfulness in the speaker? Rather it was the expression of one of those high moods for which "sinlessness" is altogether too inadequate a word. All the temper of human goodness is self-negating. We are most like God when we are so filled with the consciousness of God that we must needs repudiate all comparison with Him[1].

Again, the submission of Jesus to John's baptism of repentance is entirely intelligible for those who believe in the Atonement. To construe it as an admission that He was made in all things like unto His brethren *not* excepting sin, is wholly gratuitous. That He gave Himself to men as one who Divinely loved them involved a sharing with them of all their burdens whether of sorrow or of sin. The Baptism is the most beautiful incident in all the Gospel story before we reach the washing of the disciples' feet. What a tragic hermeneutic to see an admission of sin in the Saviour's act of sympathy with sinners!

On the plea that we know too little of our Lord's life to be sure of His sinlessness I have elsewhere written what I still feel is a cogent reply[2]. I must needs add that if He was a sinner at all He was a very great sinner. For on this supposition we must convict Him of gross inconsistencies. Certain of His sayings which are congruous with sinlessness are utterly unwarranted if He failed as we all do to keep the way of God with a perfect heart. Thus He denounced a Pharisee for saying " I thank Thee I am not as other men " and He said the same sort of thing Himself (*Mt.* 11^{25ff}). He preached humility to others (*Luke* 14^{11}) and set Himself above all the prophets and kings (*Luke* 20^{9ff}, 11^{31f}), and nearer to the Father than the angels (*Mark* 13^{32}). He bade men abstain from judging others (*Mt.* 7^{1ff}) and publicly lashed a synagogue ruler for narrow-mindedness (*Luke* 13^{15f}). He tracked men's sins to their secret source within the soul and sharpened every moral requirement of the Law: He claimed of men the fulfilment of duty all day long and at evening too, holding that even then they must needs fall short of what they might be to God; and so heightening every revealed standard of righteousness He called upon men to repent and to acknowledge their sin-debts to God as far above all similar debts to their fellows (*Mt.* 18^{31ff})—and yet never once was He known to confess any fault in Himself nor, as is the way with all the saints He has redeemed, to acknowledge that only by the grace of God was He saved. Fanatical and inconsistent—had we not better go the whole way and add with Mr.

[1] Fairbairn's *Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (375,f) has a helpful discussion of this saying about the Good.

[2] *Aspects of the Way*, 161,f.

Travers Herford[1] that in His conflict with Pharisees He was both savage and ignorant, and endorse Mr. Montefiore's accusation[2] that despite all His professions He conspicuously failed to love and forgive the men who opposed Him?

But what a psychology we are being landed in! I must not quote the Fourth Gospel as a witness for His life but really, *How can a man that is a sinner do such signs?* (*John* 9^{16}). There is no need to labour what He has done. "His life", said Fairbairn[3], "is written in the Gospels, but His history in the life of civilized man". To which we may add the words of Dr. Glover[4]:

> The cynical view that delusion and error in a real world have peculiar power in human affairs, may be dismissed; no serious student of history could hold it. For those who believe, as we all do at heart, that real effects follow real causes, and conversely that behind great movements lie great forces, the fact must weigh enormously that wherever the Christian Church, or a section of it, or a single Christian, has put upon Jesus Christ a higher emphasis—above all where everything has been centred in Jesus Christ—there has been an increase of power for Church, or community, or man.

The doctrine of the fallibility of Jesus both in His teaching and in His character involves an impossible psychology and an irrational ethical world.

II.

When, after all that he has written in criticism of some of our Lord's teaching and in doubt of His sinlessness, Dr. Cadoux[5] yet bids us regard Him as uniquely Divine, we seem to be brought into confusion. Every man, we are told, is Divine but Jesus was supremely so. But if Humanity and Divinity mean the same thing had we not better drop one of the two terms? The only use in declaring Jesus to be Divine is that thereby we affirm something about Him which does not (as yet) apply to other members of the race. There may be that in us which is like something in God. We may call that common element personality, but what separates God and man is the thing we call a moral thing. The Bible word for it is *Holiness*. *I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee* (*Hosea* 11^{9}); *The Lord GOD hath sworn by his holiness* (*Amos* 4^{2}). "That", remarks Prof. Kirkpatrick[6], "is synonymous with swearing *by Himself*". Holiness is indeed the differentia of Deity. It is, of course, a word with a long history. Beginning in the thought of physical and ceremonial separation, under the

1 *The Pharisees*, 208: "*He* denounced the Halachah (*i.e.*, Tradition) with none the less fierceness because he knew little or nothing about it."

2 *Liberal Judaism*, 135.

3 *The Place of Christ*, 378.

4 *The Jesus of History*, 3.

5 *Congregational Quarterly*, VII. 547.

6 *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, 174.

influence of prophetic teaching it came more and more to involve the conception of moral excellence linked to majesty and power. *God the Holy One,* said Isaiah, (5[16]) *is sanctified in righteousness.* The New Testament idea of Holiness is based there. But as always in the Old Testament the moral purity of God is ever associated with the thought of majesty and power[1], so also is it in the New Testament. Thus Jesus *was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead* (*Rom.* 1[4]). Holiness being the rationale of Deity Jesus was Divine and was so declared (ὁρισθέντος) by an act of supreme power.

Now I do not know that it is necessary to attempt a definition of Holiness. But surely it is not compatible with sin. Certainly it must mean the coincidence of an unfaltering will with a mind that entertains no unworthy thought. It is this which I believe about Jesus. I cannot account for His teaching, for His ministry, and for His martyrdom (with all its atoning sympathies) in any other way. Never from the dawn of consciousness to the last moments upon the Cross was there a moment when with the choice of Good and Evil before Him He failed to will the Good. The simple unclouded sense of oneness with God which resulted from this condition of His inner life accounts for all those extraordinary yet quiet assertions He made respecting Himself, and for His exercise of Divine prerogatives in respect to the revealed Law of Judaism, the forgiveness of sins, and the exercise of Judgment both in His own day and in the future. This too must be added—that just as both purity and power were linked in the Old Testament idea of Holiness so the miracles of Jesus were the natural outflowings of His blissful communion with God. In our own imperfect life we know it to be true that goodness, truthfulness, purity enhance natural ability. Could we actually imagine all that is involved in being always innocent and trustful towards God we should not have the smallest difficulty in believing the story of the feeding of the five thousand. Incredulity here (unless warranted by textual errors) results simply from an inadequate appreciation of Goodness.

Unitarianism and Trinitarianism are perhaps both worn-out labels: Chalcedonian theology is impossible: the stories of our Lord's birth do not belong to the original Apostolic Gospel: the four evangelists are not always correct. All this may be freely conceded. But when we literalize the Lord's utterances concerning the consummation of His age, and, denying His poethood, lose His vision of the Kingdom; when we doubt that reality in Him which alone may be called Divine—His true Holiness from the dawn to the dark of His mortal years—we are not only doing violence to historic

[1] Skinner in *H.D.B. II.* 308.

documents but also robbing men's hearts of their strength and consolation.

For what we all chiefly need is something more than instruction and ideal. The forgiveness of our sins is infinitely precious to the man who is conscious of wasted opportunities; yet this does not come first. Peace with God, in the full depth of the phrase, may be our final blessing. But prior to all is the craving for a vision of ultimate Goodness. When there falls upon us some unexplained disaster—a loved child, it may be, carried off by torturing disease, a comrade made imbecile for life by a street-accident: or when in the Church there sounds suddenly the crash of a falling character and an honoured minister or deacon disappears into prison or into obscurity never to be honoured again: or when we follow the tortuous policies of parties in the State, or read much in history of witchcraft, of persecution, of war—then, in such moments it is of little avail to tell us to look within our own hearts for the assurance that Goodness is the final reality, since there also we see an evil disposition, a mingling of motive, an egotism which is part of the whole problem that confronts us. Surely no more agonised cry ever rises to human lips than that which we utter then, *Oh that I knew where I might find him; That I might come even to his seat!*

To see One against whom no accusation can be laid, One who matched the highest ideal men have ever conceived with a life-ministry of uttermost love to both God and Man, is to receive not only the quieting of our distressed moods, but the purifying and uniting power of the Holy within ourselves, so that we begin to grow into the resemblance of Him we contemplate. Surely *such a high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens* (*Heb.* 7^{26}). Moreover we only express the very genius of the Gospel when we add that not only is He becoming to us, but that the giving of such a high priest to man is infinitely becoming to God.

A. D. Martin.

THE INDIVIDUAL AND MORAL PROGRESS.

In this age of problems the supreme problem is still that of the ordinary man—how can Smith make his full contribution to the moral progress of the world? When you get down to rock bottom, every other problem is concerned with ways and means of getting the best out of Smith. Our current political debate centres round him. Socialists insist that under the capitalist regime we are wasting Smith's human resources and destroying his possibilities. Their opponents retort that in a socialist State Smith's private enterprise and individual initiative would be hampered and thwarted at every turn, so that his best would never be forthcoming. But, whenever the question is being seriously argued, both sides are agreed that the ultimate test of all political and social arrangements must be what happens to Smith. Obviously he is an important person. The legislature, State education, public health services, national defences, the League of Nations, the churches—all exist for the sake of Smith; to provide for his bodily and mental needs, for the security of his person and his property, for his general well-being, temporal and spiritual. He is the pivot of all social organization, his welfare the goal of all social purposes. Is it possible that such titanic efforts can fail, that in a society organized for his benefit Smith can still remain a disgruntled, half-hearted weakling? It is not only possible, it is a fact.

For mighty influences are conspiring together to depress the ordinary man. In industry, mass production has seriously curtailed his opportunities of finding in his daily work the normal expression of his personality. The products of his toil have largely lost that individual quality which distinguished those of the old craftsmen. Unemployment has brought him the bitter knowledge that he is only a "hand," a "spare part" in the monstrous machine. If Smith is an employer he is scarcely better off. For he is still being moulded to a stock pattern by the pressure of competition and hard times. In fact, all of us—parsons and manufacturers, road sweepers and civil servants—are being standardized according to our particular function in the social economy. And not only our work, but our mental attitudes—our thoughts and views—tend more and more to become an outlook upon life which is no longer genuinely our own but that of the social class or profession or calling to which we belong. We seldom realize how deeply we are committed to these ready-made opinions and attitudes. 'Class-consciousness"—being conscious of itself—is nothing like so insidiously dangerous to individuality as this "class-unconsciousness."

This state of things is reflected in current political theory. Herbert Spencer, writing at a time when the pure orthodoxy of "Laissez-faire" was being undermined by encroachments of the rising tide of social and industrial legislation, interpreted the situation under the formula "The Man *versus* the State," and championed the rights of the individual against State interference. Modern political theory is still concerned with his problem—that of the limits of State interference—but his formula has been abandoned. For the group—the voluntary society—has largely taken the place of the individual, and the status and rights of the latter are considered as inhering in his membership within the social group. Smith is considered no longer as an unqualified, isolated individual, but as a member of groups—as a trade unionist, or an employer, or a doctor, or a churchman. Now this method of dealing with the individual and his rights undoubtedly stresses a truth which the old, atomistic individualism ignored. Smith is not a bare unit; he is not only a social ingredient, he is a social product. He is what he is, not as isolated from his fellows, but as linked with them in a hundred different ways. He is the father of a family, a clerk or a commercial traveller, a golfer, a citizen, and so on; and the truth about Smith is not forthcoming until we have considered him in all these various relationships. So much must be granted. Yet the ease with which Smith can be pigeon-holed into the different classes and groups to which he belongs leads only too naturally to the assumption that when we have taken account of his functions in all these several capacities we have exhausted his significance as an individual. It needs to be emphasized that these groups, with their demands upon Smith and his responses to them, only provide the context, the raw material, of his moral self; the driving power of his personality must come from another source. No doubt it is convenient to pigeon-hole Smith with thousands more Smiths who are fathers and employers, for so you make him available for sociologists and others who are interested in statistics about fathers and employers. And such statistics will reveal some of the truth about him. But the whole truth about Smith—his real individuality—is a magnitude which no statistics can ever declare and no scientific methods can ever expound; for it is revealed not by uniformities but by differences, not by the functions of father or employer, but by Smith's own way of discharging those functions. The significant thing about Smith—his Smithness, so to say—is manifest, not in the fact that he is a father or an employer, but in the kind of father, the kind of employer, he is.

In short, we are all members of groups, and in these common relationships and in the common duties they impose we should be as indistinguishable as peas in a pod were it not for the fact that even when we do the same things we do them differently. Other people can do our work—that is what makes

us feel we are lost in the crowd; but no one else can do it in our unique, individual way—that is what makes us think we may count for something, after all. "What do ye more than others?", asked Jesus. It is only another phrasing of the same question to ask, "What do ye differently from others?". For in a vital sense we must be different if we would make a difference. And this does not mean mere unconventionality or any sort of Bohemian crankiness, but being a moral self—for the moral self is always unique.

The war finally discredited the facile optimism which believed in the inevitability of moral progress. We have outgrown, let us hope, the naïve idea that, as Dean Inge has said, people who travel at sixty miles an hour are five times as civilized as those who travel at twelve. It is now a truism that growing scientific knowledge and increasing command over the external world, so far from being identical with moral progress, are not even necessarily parallel with it. We have seen that the two can be widely sundered, with science advancing by leaps and bounds while morality lags behind or is even at a standstill. The next world-war—which God prevent—will be far more scientific than the last. It will represent an enormous advance in human knowledge. It will also mean the destruction of the higher values of civilization and moral bankruptcy on a world scale. Moral progress—that is, advance in the art of living well—is possible only when man's mastery of Nature goes step by step with his mastery of himself. And it is because of the enormously greater difficulty of the latter task and the terrible revelation of moral failure which the war brought with it, that to the pre-war optimism has succeeded a post-war pessimism which believes that human nature does not change, that man always has been and always will be a fighting, predatory animal, and that moral progress is impossible.

The truth lies somewhere between these extremes. As against the optimists we must insist that moral progress is neither automatic within society nor a purely natural growth. There is nothing inevitable about it. If the race elects to commit suicide there is nothing in the nature of things to stop it. Yet against the pessimists we claim that moral progress is possible—at a price. It is an achievement to which individuals directly contribute. Indeed, the initial cost of moral progress has always been borne and must always be borne by the individual.

Now we make our individual contributions to moral progress by being individuals, which, we saw, means not only doing our duty, but doing it in a certain unique way. It is not so much our moral output which counts towards progress, as our motives and life-attitudes—our individuality. This is somewhat difficult doctrine. I hear someone say: "Surely what matters is that duty should be done, that a man should deliver the goods. His motives, moods, feelings, and attitudes, cannot matter two pins; it is his outward

acts with their results which really count." It is true, no doubt, that only the latter can be measured. It is also true that since acts can be roughly gauged we can fix some standard the attainment of which will mean that duty has been done. But we are dealing with men, not machines. A man's capacity for his daily duty, whether that be laying bricks, securing orders, or preparing sermons, is governed by other factors besides technical efficiency and the economic necessity of making a living. In industry the effort is made to win a larger output by offering material incentives of various kinds. But we shall not solve our industrial problems—or any others for that matter—until we are securing from every man the very best he has it in him to be and to do. And this can neither be wrung from him by coercion nor wheedled out of him by bribes. It depends upon his own personal attitude towards life. Of course if self-interest is the dominant factor in human activity, then no other explanation need be sought for the dislocations and blunderings of our civilization. So long as self-interest rules, the best will never be forthcoming, either in the individual or in society. But the world's best work has owed next to nothing to this motive. Art, literature, science, religion, social betterment—think of the masters and pioneers in these ranges of human activity and then ask how many of them have worked for a wage or a profit, or that they might fare sumptuously, or that they might win the applause of men. Judged by every material standard, they gave infinitely more than they received, and died with the world in their debt. They did their duty—and how much more than their duty!—but why and how? The answer is simple and profound. They gave because they could not withhold, because they were impelled by an inward constraint, because—in a word—they were inspired. And Smith will be and do his best in no other way.

"But these were extraordinary men." Granted. There is only one Michelangelo in a thousand years. But that is because his particular task is rarely set by the great Taskmaster. The task of being a self and contributing to moral progress has been set for every mother's son of us, and for its fulfilment we need an inspiration, different in kind, but just as real as Michelangelo's or Shakespeare's. We are seeking some power which can make the ordinary man extraordinary, which can make Smith a true individual, a moral self. Where shall we find it? Open a magazine and read the advertisements. Here it is, the very thing! "Why aren't you earning more? Take our correspondence course. If you are a commercial traveller, learn to hold your customers with your glittering eye—and double your income." Not so. Personality is a by-product; we achieve it while we are absorbed in other tasks. This is why religion has had very little to say about self-realization and a great deal about self-sacrifice and service. We have as we spend; we rule as we serve; we live as we die.

If Smith, then, is to be his best, Smith must be inspired; fo his best is won only by what wins him. So we return to the inade quacy of merely doing one's duty. Conscientiousness is not enoug —for it is uninspired. When I am content to do my duty as a parso as that duty is understood by parsons in general; when you are con tent to conform to those standards of honour prevailing among you fellows—when each of us is contributing a good average, or even bit over the average—we are not really contributing to moral pro gress. The most that can be said of us is that we are keeping thing from slipping back—although, since the absence of progress usuall means retrogression, even this is doubtful. But in practice th situation in which we find ourselves is never so simple as this. Eac of us, we saw, belongs to different groups to which we owe loyalty What is to happen when these loyalties conflict? It is hard enoug to choose what we know to be our duty in face of temptations t neglect or deny it. It is harder still—although the difficulty is o another order—to decide among competing duties, each of whic has a genuine claim upon us. This situation sets our moral proble in its acutest, most complex form. And a merely imitative moralit is quite helpless when confronted by it. Many try to shelve the issue and attempt to shut away the conflicting claims in logic-tight com partments—as when a man keeps his business separate from hi religion. But this is a poor makeshift which leads obviously enoug to bad religion, and, not so obviously, though just as certainly, t bad business. And in any case a man's individuality demands unified self, and unity is not possible in such conditions. No. Th problem must be faced, and we must each contribute our individua solution or fail to pull our weight in the community boat. And real solution is impossible apart from a constant, critical scrutiny c accepted standards. When we stop asking " Is it done? ", an begin to ask "Is it right? ", we rise from a purely imitative moralit to a morality truly creative, from the pedestrian level of conscientiou ness to the inspired heights of conscience. And this inspiration given to us just as soon as we are willing to face the truth and liv by it—not partial truths but the truth of God, the eternal facts of li and destiny. For truth alone can inspire men for service and sel hood.

Why is it, then, that with such resources the ordinary man st flounders and drifts in uninspired living? Well, religion has a answer to that question, but since to-day we are more ready to liste to the psychologists than the parsons, let us hear the psychologist They tell us that man will endure almost any misfortune rather tha face the truth—because if he faced it he would have to do somethin about it, and that would be inconvenient. So he manages to bu the awkward facts and forget them. It is true that he is seldom ful aware of his cowardice; it is mainly by unconscious contrivance th

he defends himself against devastating truth. One very common method is to call the fact an "ideal," and then it can be removed to a safe distance from every-day life. We reverence the ideal—and carry on as usual. Take brotherhood, for example. Here is the primary fact of human social life which men have elected to regard as a vain dream or a Utopian arrangement. And the war proved to demonstration that brotherhood is not a dream but a fact, so that if men will not live together in a brotherhood of mutual service they must perish together in a brotherhood of mutual destruction—for brothers they are. It is not the idealist who is the vain, unpractical dreamer, but the selfish coward who believes in his heart that whoever sinks he will manage to keep afloat, who fondly imagines that he can contract out of that unity whereby we are all members one of another. Most of the moral evil in the world has its root in this poor-spirited timid selfishness. Smith may complain that he is lost in the crowd —but what is his grievance? He *likes* to be lost in the crowd, to do as others do, to carry on in his comfortable, peddling little way. But moral progress and the destiny of the race wait for Smith to screw his courage to the point of facing the truth of things. Brotherhood is a fact. Very well, then, whether in international affairs or in industry, something has got to be done about it—and by Smith.

You can pretend that reality is not there, if it suits your convenience to do so. But do not be surprised or complain if sooner or later reality trips you up. This world was not built to our specifications. Doubtless we should have made it a far more comfortable place to live in. But the Almighty knows His business, and He made it to be the scene of moral heroism, a place where men might live and grow.

So we must be brave enough to face the truth, which alone can liberate our best. And we face it each for himself. Why is moral progress so slow while science advances by leaps and bounds? Because the scientist can begin where his predecessors leave off. He need not repeat their mistakes or follow them down all the blind alleys in which they wandered. But in the moral race everybody starts from scratch, and moral progress depends upon new victories won by individual Smiths over the ancient temptations. You can give your son that university education you never had; you can exempt him from those disheartening handicaps which embittered your own youth. But you cannot shield him from his own soul's battle. You may leave him a fortune, but you cannot bequeath your moral victory. For this he must win for himself, and unless he wins it his inheritance is more likely to be a curse to him than a blessing. It is true you may help him with advice, and still more by your example; but the fight is his own. And to spare him this—if you could—would be to rob him of his birthright. For he was born that he might win his own victory and make this supreme contribution to the betterment of the world.

No wonder the ordinary man is important, for in Smith the human race makes a new beginning and this old world gets a new chance. Mass-production is not God's method in creating human lives. As the great artist paints a hundred pictures and makes each one a masterpiece, unique after its kind, so the Great Craftsman has fashioned you and me. It is the virtue of spare parts to be exactly similar and interchangeable; it is the virtue of selves to be unique and irreplaceable. When God had made Smith He broke the mould. But Smith can become what God means him to be only if he is brave enough to live in the real world. For truth is no dream and no joke; live by it and you live indeed; flout it and you miss your way and make it harder for others to find theirs. It is a long and arduous task which has been set us. It is not always easy to know what is right and often all that seems given to us is a choice between two evils. But if we are inspired we shall not wholly fail. For we are saved from futility not by our faultlessness but by our reverence; and the great Taskmaster will ask, not "Have you succeeded?", but "Have you tried? ". With all our sins and cowardice you and I are the very spearhead of God's own advance against all manner of evil, and if at the end we have made it a little easier for others to believe in God and goodness and to be their best for Him and their fellows, we shall have done a man's work and played a hero's part.

H. F. Lovell Cocks.

EDUCATION—THE NEW SITUATION.

DURING the May meetings last year two middle-aged Congregational ministers were standing in the porch of the Memorial Hall discussing an item of educational news which had appeared in the morning paper. There joined them a third, a younger man, who after listening for a few minutes broke in: "The Education Controversy! My dear fellows, it is dead and buried—completely!", and moved off, quite uninterested in what he considered to be merely an unhappy battle of long ago.

One wonders if his attitude is typical of the younger ministers and laymen of the Free Churches. If so, it may be that a survey of some modern movements in the educational world and in certain ecclesiastical circles will awaken them to the fact that education is one of the dominant subjects of our politics—as much alive in many quarters as the questions of unemployment or disarmament—and that there is urgent need for Nonconformists to be on the alert.

A new situation has arisen. It results partly from the widespread acceptance of the *Report on the Education of the Adolescent,* issued early in 1927 by the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education and known from its chairman as the "Hadow Report". Partly too it arises from the re-assertion of ecclesiastical demands which Nonconformists have always considered unjust and which educationists believe would militate against the fullest success of the new proposals. Enemies of a completely fair and free national system, against whom our fathers fought, if not with complete success, at any rate effectively enough to keep them quiet for a time, have risen again, more powerfully organized than ever they were, determined to push their claims and to wreck the "religious settlement" embodied in all the Education Acts since 1870.

The "Hadow Report" recommends that at the beginning of the school year 1932 the school-leaving age for all children should be raised to fifteen. It calls for a complete re-organization of the schools, and suggests that every normal child should pass at about the age of eleven to a new type of school with curricula designed to meet the many varying aptitudes of the children and the needs of particular localities. The suggestion has been welcomed everywhere with enthusiasm by believers in education. It is felt to be a great opportunity. The task of these "modern schools" (as it is suggested they should be called) is to deal with the children from 11—15 years of age—"a four year course with complete freedom to try out promising experiments, untrammelled by external academic examinations, to provide the country with healthy, self-respecting, self-reliant young people".

Influenced probably by the almost universal approval and no doubt concerned at the extent of juvenile unemployment, the Government has given notice of its intention to introduce legislation to give effect to these proposals, and to extend the school-leaving age to fifteen years as from 1st April, 1931. This will mean the re-organization of all the schools and the planning of entirely new curricula for the new "modern" schools. It will mean also, since room will have to be found for some 400,000 more children, the adaptation of old buildings, the erection of new ones, and the grouping of schools for the purposes of junior and senior instruction.

The re-organization would be fairly simple if we had a unified system of control and only one type of elementary school. But here again, as in nearly all educational matters, complications are likely to arise from our lamentable system of Dual Control and the existence of non-provided or voluntary schools. Which brings us to the second element in the new situation—the disturbing element.

The Education Act of 1902, which introduced important reforms in administration, left the buildings of the Voluntary Schools in the possession of the denominations, and the religious teaching under the authority of the school managers, who retained the right to appoint the teachers. As a result there are to-day nearly 10,000 schools maintained and equipped by public money, but owned and governed by members of the Anglican Church, where denominational religious teaching is given and in which it is difficult for a Nonconformist teacher to gain appointment as an assistant and practically impossible for him to gain a headship. The entire salary of all teachers is, of course, paid out of public money. The enactment amounted to an endowment of denominationalism out of public funds, whilst in several essential matters the denominational schools are exempt from public control.

Many Nonconformists registered their disapproval in the Passive Resistance Movement, which in a few years died out, not because the Nonconformists acquiesced, but because they saw that time would adjust the grievance. Whilst the State had undertaken to maintain these schools it still refused to build them, and it demanded, in recognition, we suppose, of the State's generosity, that the owners should at their own cost keep the school buildings in a satisfactory state of repair. It was foreseen that in time many of these schools would be surrendered owing to the difficulty of finding money to repair the fabric. That has actually happened. An average taken over twenty-five years shows a decrease of 120 a year. So our grievance was adjusting itself. But the Anglican Church, which is mainly concerned, views this dwindling with dismay. Many of its leaders are determined to check it, and that is where the danger, or one of the dangers, of the present situation lies. It is important that we should know what is happening.

Sometime before 1923 there was formed, largely by the influence of the present Archbishop of York—then Bishop of Manchester—an "Association for the Defence of Church Schools". Amongst its objects are these:—

(1) The retention, maintenance, and improvement of all existing Church Schools.

(2) The preservation of the present system of Dual Control as the only guarantee for the training of children in the Church's faith.

(3) To take all necessary steps to secure the providing of sufficient Church Schools in new districts.

This Association, which now has branches all over England, has raised large sums of money, but not nearly sufficient for its needs. However profoundly we may deprecate its aims and differ from its views of the function of national education, we must frankly admit that we can have no complaint against its methods, in the present state of the law. We lament the attempt to perpetuate the dual system; but it is at their own cost, by voluntary subscriptions, that these Anglicans are endeavouring to maintain their position. When, however, we read the reports of the speeches of some of their leaders at their Association Meetings, we cannot but be afraid of their influence. At a meeting in Manchester Dr. Temple said: "We have our Church Elementary Schools, we have our Church Secondary Schools, and we must have our Church Central Schools as well." At the establishment of the Birmingham branch in 1927 the Rev. Canon Thicknesse pointed out that the Church upheld an idea of education which was absolutely distinctive. If the Church of England gave up her schools there would be "two types of schools only — the *Roman Catholic Christian Schools and the secular schools*". The distinction, with its implied judgment of the Council schools, is worth noticing—the *Roman Catholic Christian* and the *secular*!

The leaders of the Anglican Church are keenly interested in education. September 15th last was appointed by the Archbishop of York as a day of special prayer in all churches in the province "to impress upon Church people the principles of Christian education and the concern which all Christians ought to feel for the progress of education generally". The subject is discussed at almost every Diocesan Conference, and strong committees are studying the problem and elaborating policies. As long ago as October, 1923, a Manchester Diocesan Committee, presided over by Dr. Temple, adopted an important "Memorandum on Religious Education". It endeavoured frankly to recognize and allow for our views, seemed to suggest that agreement was impossible, and urged the State to support two types of schools, denominational and undenominational.

Thus it pleaded for public money to build and support Church

Schools, the Diocesan authorities to retain control. Alternatively it asked for legislative provision to secure that when a voluntary school is transferred to the Local Authority denominational religious instruction should be given as before. There are suggestions also of right of entry and a type of ecclesiastical control.

In November, 1926, the Education Commission of the Church Assembly (the Bishop of Wakefield presiding), which had been studying the subject for several years, presented its "Third Report". Its demands were almost entirely reactionary. These are just a few of them, sufficient to show the trend:—

1. Denominational schools to be regarded equally with Council schools as part of the national system, and the State to give real security for their distinctive character.
2. Any Local Authority to be empowered to build, or aid in the building of, new denominational schools.
3. Managers (now independent bodies) to surrender to ecclesiastical authorities.

The demands of this more extreme section of the Anglican Church were voiced even more strongly at the Wakefield Diocesan Conference on 15th Oct. last, when the Diocesan Director of Religious Education (Canon W. J. Brown) urged in his Report that the bishops of the Church of England should "*go along with the Roman Catholics* and fight this battle together, to get a fair deal out of the Government both on the question of grants and religious teaching." Also on 17th Oct., at the Chelmsford Diocesan Conference, the Bishop of Chelmsford pleaded for a "direct grant" to Anglican Schools.

A few years ago in many counties attempts were made to compromise on the religious difficulties by means of what were called "concordats". These held some promise of facilitating the work of the Education Authorities, but the extravagant demands of the Anglicans have in almost every case killed them. I believe it is right to say that in no county is a concordat now working.

Another attempt to get over the difficulty was suggested by the Lancashire County Council Education Committee. It was that an Enabling Bill should be passed through Parliament to empower Local Education Authorities to make separate bargains with voluntary school managers for the taking over or the conditioning of their schools. This movement was opposed by Nonconformists, somewhat feebly, because of its confessed purpose of spending public money on denominational schools. It failed of acceptance, not, however, as a result of our half-hearted opposition, but because the Anglican Church again made such claims that Lord Eustace Percy, then President of the Board of Education, after having promised qualified support, simply dared not consider it.

Aware of all these sectional movements one awaited with impatience the Report of the Archbishops' Commission, appointed, with Sir W. H. Hadow as Chairman, as long ago as 1924, to investigate the subject and make recommendations. The Report was published last October and forms a book of 195 pages. There is much in it with which Free Churchmen will heartily agree, and when it deals with controversial matters its language is conciliatory. But the recommendations are such that, if they were adopted, almost the whole of public education would be under Anglican control. Apparently some suggestions are similar to those made in the "Resolutions" of the Congregational Union; actually they do not seem to mean the same things. For example, it is urged that religious instruction should be entrusted to teachers adequately trained. But they emphasize that they mean teachers trained in specially equipped Anglican Training Colleges or under Anglican influences in the Universities, and upon whom, whether in Church or Council Schools, the Church may depend. They recommend the formulation of agreed syllabuses, to be prepared by Joint Committees representative of all denominations and the teaching profession; but at the same time they desire to preserve as many Church Schools as possible, where the religious instruction will be different. Thus they would influence the Council Schools as well as control their own. They recommend the retention of the Cowper Temple clause, not because they believe in it—on the contrary, its abandonment, to facilitate local agreements, would be "ideally the best solution"—but because its removal would "challenge almost unanimous opposition of Local Authorities and teachers". There is a proposal also for an alteration in the law, enabling the Board of Education to make special grants for the repair, enlargement, and equipment of Church Schools.

Behind the whole Report is the theory, against which Free Churchmen have always protested and must still protest, that national education is a service which the State should pay for and the Church control.

Thus the more moderate Majority Report. The Minority Report more drastically demands withdrawal of the Cowper Temple clause, building grants for non-provided schools, and the repeal of the regulations which govern religious instruction in the Secondary Schools.

These Reports were discussed by the Church Assembly on 15th Nov., 1929. The extremists were restive, but it was decided merely to receive the Reports and let the matter simmer until next spring. Two resolutions were unanimously adopted, one demanding assistance from public funds for non-provided schools, the other asking the Archbishops to appoint a committee to confer with the Government and the Associations of Local Education Authorities as to their re-organization policy and its effect on non-provided schools.

All the movements and agitations here reviewed are now therefore concentrated in a definite official attempt to overturn the settlement of 1902.

The activities of the Roman Catholics are perhaps even more threatening. It is well known that at the General Election nearly every candidate in the country was asked definitely to pledge himself to support the proposal to spend public money upon the building of new Roman Catholic Schools and the repair of existing ones, without any extension of public control. And Catholics were advised (and in at least some cases directed) to vote only for candidates whose answer was deemed satisfactory. It is not so generally known that they have for a number of years adopted the same tactics in many towns in municipal elections. By this means they hope to pack Local Education Authorities with their supporters.

Faced with the new proposals the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales met on 14th Nov. last and unanimously passed a resolution that "The Bishops are of opinion that any grant given to Provided Schools to enable them to meet the requirements of the Board of Education should in equity be given also to the Non-Provided Schools".

This continual pressure by such powerful corporations as the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches has had a tremendous influence upon the Local Education Authorities, whose chief desire is to get on with the task of education. The result is that there are often obscure and secret negotiations between the Local Authorities and these Churches, by means of which a real revolution is being silently effected. The law is being strained or evaded. Occasionally the result comes to light, as in the case of the notorious "Dorset Letter", which was a deliberate offer on the part of the Board of Education to wink at, or even to further, an open breach of the "Cowper Temple" and the "Conscience" clauses of 1870 and to allow denominational teaching in a Council School. The "Playground Judgment" still stands—an equally ingenious "sanction" for spending public money on private premises, which arose out of a misleading "statement" supplied to the High Court by the Board, and a suppression of the appeal to a Higher Court when it was initiated. Thus the Local Education Authorities are being influenced.

The effect of these movements on the policy of the late Government was most marked. The closing of black-listed schools was slowed up, so that many which were condemned in 1924 are still in use. Before the general election, and as part of their election campaign, the Government developed truculent schemes of reaction to catch votes, threatening the Cowper Temple clause, showing many leanings towards ecclesiastical control and commercial control of the schools. They even promised a new Education Act which should provide for the repair and modernization of all black-listed school

buildings—a definite pledge to spend public money on privately-owned denominational school buildings.

But what of the present Government? It must not be forgotten that the public opinion which governments reflect is the opinion of which they are made most clearly aware. There are many members of Parliament to-day, both within and without the Government, who made definite pledges to the Roman Catholics at the election. For example, Bradford is represented by four Labour members, all of whom gained the Roman Catholic vote by making the pledge and publishing the fact. So reaction is well inside the House of Commons. It is urgently necessary that a strong counter-acting influence be brought to bear upon the Government from outside.

To return to the subject of the new situation in relation to further education. The Diocesan Authorities have welcomed the new proposals and have circularized the managers of the Anglican schools, urging them to further the plans of the "Hadow Report" as far as possible by the grouping of junior schools and the establishing of modern or central schools. They add, however, that influence should be exerted to ensure that the new modern schools—or a proportion of them—shall be "Church Schools".

This has been taking place ever since the Board of Education encouraged the formation of selective Central Schools, and what has already happened indicates what will be the general result. In forming a Central School the best building in the area has, of course, been chosen. This has generally been a Council School; in many places the only Council School available has been taken for this purpose, usually after secret negotiations with voluntary school managers. Parents and Nonconformists have seldom been consulted, and in many cases they have been surprised to find a new scheme ready made and adopted, by which all children under twelve are forced into Anglican Schools. In some cases Nonconformist opinion has been strong enough to defeat the scheme. But that has had a lamentable result in that these towns have been left without a desired Central School. Sometimes jealousy between a good Anglican school and an equally good Council school has made the Local Authority afraid to make the necessary advance.

But now there can be no further delay, since everywhere, if the Government's plans mature, the re-organization must take place. The situation bristles with difficulties. It is quite certain that the voluntary schools cannot meet the new demand. Nor can Free Churchmen, on the other hand, ignore the convinced belief of many in the Anglican Church in the denominational system. The Government has promised to increase the Treasury grant to Education Authorities for building schemes, during the next three years, from the present allowance of 20 per cent. to 50 per cent. of the total cost. The rest of the money will come from the rates. All the powerful

influences outlined above are being brought strongly to bear upon Parliament to allow part of that money to be spent on Anglican and Roman Catholic schools without any extension of public control or any diminution of denominational privilege. Sir Charles Trevelyan, President of the Board of Education, when introducing his new proposals to Parliament on 13th Nov., stated that he could not offer the building grants to voluntary schools unless there was a definite movement of agreement in the country. He pleaded for goodwill. "If," he said, "in Lancashire and Leicestershire and other places local authorities could get a settlement with goodwill on their part and on the part of the local clergy and the local bishop it could be done in the rest of England." But what are these agreements, and are Free Churchmen ever consulted? On one occasion, at least, when Diocesan representatives have held a lengthy conference, *in camera*, with a County Authority, it has been impossible to learn what transpired.

What ought Free Churchmen to do? First of all, they must assert afresh and firmly the principles for which they stand, and emphasize that they do so, not as denominationalists, but as citizens who believe that State Education can be really efficient only in so far as children are regarded simply as children of the State, without denominational distinction. Denominational teaching is the business of the Churches, for which the Churches should be prepared to pay and which should not encroach upon a national or State service. So it must be strongly urged:—

1. That education be developed promptly and maintained adequately on the lines of progress, popular control, and religious liberty.
2. That no new facilities for sectarian teaching be provided, and that the Cowper Temple Clause be strictly observed.
3. That public money shall be given as building grants only for premises to be owned and controlled by a Public Authority.

Also they must be on the alert to guard against new agreements being imposed upon any area without the consent of Free Churchmen, and to insist on the Free Churches being definitely represented whenever negotiations are undertaken with a view to re-organization.

It is not enough merely to protest. We must endeavour to find an agreed solution. Many influential leaders of the Anglican Church are anxious to find a way satisfactory to all, and are not likely to be led away by their extremists. Hopeful lines of approach would be to canvass further the possibilities of an agreed syllabus of religious instruction in every area, to apply to all schools alike; also to discuss the matter of facilities for the training of teachers in Biblical scholarship, of course without sectarian or ecclesiastical tests.

But nothing can be done without definite and concerted study and

effort. I would urge that the time has come for a really strong committee to be formed, such as that appointed by the Anglicans at the Church Assembly, and for the same purpose, "to confer with the Government and the Associations of Local Education Authorities as to their re-organization policy". This should be done at once. It should be a committee that would stand comparison with that of the Archbishops and command as much respect in Parliamentary quarters. Thus we should bring the force of Free Church opinion to bear upon the Government and the State. If the Free Churches do not take action soon, they may find themselves again, as in 1902, with a settlement, agreed between Parliament and the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, imposed upon them, and again dignified with the pseudonym "compromise".

Such a committee would not be without external support. The Free Churches do not stand alone. Most educational experts—amongst them many Anglicans—and probably the whole body of the teaching profession would support the demand for a free, unified, and unsectarian system.

D. S. Johns.

ENGLAND'S INDEBTEDNESS TO NONCONFORMITY MUSICALLY

Upon the ears of many otherwise well-informed readers the title o this paper will fall with a peculiar and unaccustomed sound Theologically, politically, and socially, the enormous indebtedne of England to Nonconformity has been generally acknowledged b impartial historians, although, at times, grudgingly and, in som cases, ungraciously. On the other hand, however, the connexio between Nonconformity and music is one which has been practicall ignored by Free Church historians, and woefully misrepresented b the majority of musical writers. Of these regrettable facts th second is not so surprising when we remember that many historie of English music have been written by men whose ecclesiastical an political opinions were in direct opposition to those commonly hel by Free Churchmen. Other writers who conscientiously endeavoure to distinguish between history and propaganda could not possibl be in possession of facts revealed by recent research.

To set down as the first instalment of England's music indebtedness to Nonconformity any portion of the labours of th travelling preachers who, in the 14th century, were "sent forth t minister" by that first great English Dissenter from the Roma heresy, John Wycliffe, would be to base a claim upon a etymological rather than upon an historical foundation, since th only proof we have that the Lollards sang as they taught is th supposed derivation of their distinctive name from the old Germa *lollen,* to sing soothingly, and *hard,* a common affix of that perio But whatever songs they may have sung were silenced in the priest persecutions under the fourth and fifth Henrys, and two centuri elapsed before the occurrence of any important musical eve in which conscientious objectors to Popery or Episcopacy pa ticipated. Then it was that there returned to their native countr numbers of English Protestants who, in Germany, Holland, an Geneva, had found refuge from the storms of the Marian persecutio These good people brought with them many Genevan tunes, such a the *Old 100th, Toulon,* and (possibly) *St. Michael's;* also other such as the *Old 104th,* which latter tunes were probably the pr ductions of certain musicians, unknown to fame, who were include in the "goodly company" of the Protestant refugees.

But, although amongst the returning exiles there were to b found many men afterwards prominent in their opposition Episcopacy, it would be an anachronism to claim the musical effor of any such as constituting definite evidence of England's indebte ness to Nonconformity musically. As a whole the early Purita were not Nonconformists. They endeavoured to reform the Sta

Church from within. With the "schism" of the Brownists, as the Congregationalists were first called, they had as little sympathy as with the "heresy" of the Anabaptists. To liberty of conscience they were strangers. Indeed it was not until after 1662, when 2,000 clergymen vacated their livings rather than submit to the notorious Act of Uniformity, that the Nonconformists and the Puritans became one. Nor were the Presbyterians of the 17th century really Nonconformists. On the contrary, their efforts were directed towards the imposition upon the nation of the Solemn League and Covenant instead of the Prayer Book and the Thirty-Nine Articles.

To most readers of this article the foregoing facts are probably familiar. Their recital, however, is necessary in order to enable us to understand the position of affairs in 1644, when there was issued the Parliamentary "ordinance" decreeing the defacement of images and the demolition of organs "in all churches and chapells". Here the motive power was largely the Presbyterian dislike of the "kist o' whistles". As usual, Cromwell and the Nonconformists generally have been credited with this act of vandalism; but, as that able historian, Mr. Henry Davey, remarks, " Nearly all the damage was wrought in 1642, when Cromwell was only a captain over 60 horse, a man unknown to public fame and quite uninfluential." Prejudiced propagandists have endeavoured to make capital out of the manner in which the "ordinance" was carried out. In this respect they have over-reached themselves, as the Ironsides of Cromwell were too sober and godly a set of men to "break down the organs and pawn the pipes at several ale-houses for pots of ale". The destruction of organs, in all probability, was carried out by that human scum and wreckage which always hangs about the rear of a military force. Possibly, too, these vandals were countenanced or assisted by men who had suffered in person and estate for their religious and political principles—wise men driven mad by oppression—who now deemed they were doing God good service by destroying everything which might remind them of the regal and ecclesiastical tyranny to which they had been subjected. The organ had been a prominent participant in the Popish service and in the ritualistic ceremonies of Laud. Hence the Puritans declined to tolerate it. Music and its chief exponent suffered on account of abhorrent associations.

But all the doomed organs were not destroyed. St. Paul's, York, Durham, and Lincoln Cathedrals retained their instruments. The organ of Magdalen College was "removed to Hampton Court, and frequently played upon to Cromwell's great content". This, however, not until after 1654, as in July of that year Evelyn heard it at Oxford, manipulated by Christopher Gibbons, son of the illustrious Orlando. Probably, as Dr. Rimbault remarks, its removal was due to "some amicable arrangement between Cromwell and the President and Fellows".

Nor was the "destruction" of organs an altogether unmixed evil Neither was it one of such magnitude as our modern ideas of organ distribution and dimension would lead us to believe. In the earlie half of the 17th century organs in England were not as plentiful a blackberries in autumn: only the cathedrals and larger parish churches could boast of their possession. Of these instruments the majority were very small: many possessed but one manual practically none had pedals or pedal pipes. Also their use was no to accompany congregational singing but to add brilliancy by the addition of "all possible embellishments by means of florid runs" —as Dr. Barrett says, "not unlike the extemporaneous descant in which country organists were wont to indulge many years back while accompanying the chants and psalms". To that style of music, said Mr. Davey, "the Puritans objected; and so should we object if we heard it now", only, instead of destroying the instrument, we should give the organist notice to quit. So then, if the Nonconformists o the Protectorate period united with the Puritans and the Presby terians in the removal of the unmusical absurdities above mentioned they certainly did more good than harm in this respect. Only to their method of reformation should exception be taken.

In his thesis on *Milton's Knowledge of Music,* Dr. S. G. Spaeth asserts that "the attack upon ecclesiastical music strengthened the interest in secular music, and its popularity increased rather than diminished". The reality of this revival is proved by the fact that according to Mr. Andrew Deakin's *Musical Bibliography,* more musi and musical works were published during the Protectorate than in the whole reign of Charles I. Also Milton states that in the London o his day lutes, viols, and guitars were to be found "in every house" Hence Mr. Davey declares that to speak of music *per se* as being prohibited or even discouraged during the Commonwealth i "absolute and unqualified falsehood". And the leading Non conformists were the greatest music lovers of that time. Thus w find Cromwell engaging John Hingston to be his private organist a a salary of £100 *per annum;* and even that biased and bullying Middlesex magistrate, Sir John Hawkins, in his monumental *History of Music,* of 1776, bears testimony not only to Oliver's love of musi but to his personal interest in musicians, for he made good th salaries of some of those who had lost their appointments owing t the abolition of the cathedral service. On festive occasions durin the Protectorate music was always in evidence, Cromwell considerin music and dancing to be "very good diversions". Even at hi funeral there was music rendered by "two lads brought up to music and eight singing men, as Mr. Joseph Bennett remarks, "a notabl body of artists for those times". Prior to this—in February, 1656– Hingston and others petitioned Cromwell's Council "that there be Corporation or College of Musicians created in London, with reason

able powers to read and practice publiquely all sorts of Musick". The "petition" was favourably entertained, and a committee appointed to "receive any addresses that shall be made to them, in order to ye advancement of Musick, and to report to ye Counsell as they shall have cause". The death of Cromwell put a stop to any further action: otherwise we might have been indebted to Nonconformity for the establishment of the first English College of Music. Instead of which a century and a half elapsed before the establishment of the Royal Academy of Music as a "proprietary" school of the then Duke of Westmoreland.

Amongst other prominent Nonconformists to whom we are indebted musically, mention should be made of Colonel Hutchinson, the Baptist, a man described by his wife as one who "could dance admirably, had great love for music, and often diverted himself with a viol on which he played masterly", possessing "an exact ear and judgment in other music". Milton, who, if anything denominationally, was a Congregationalist, was not only a lover of music, as is proved by his poems *At a Solemn Music* and *Il Penseroso,* and from the frequent references to music in his works, but he was a well-trained and skilful performer. During his closing years he is said to have played for an hour daily on either the organ or the viol, while even his final illness was soothed by song.

During the Parliamentary regime music makings in London and Oxford were fairly numerous. Cromwell's attendance at the former is certified by statements (too lengthy for quotation here) which were made by Sir Roger L'Estrange, a noted performer on the viols and, after the Restoration, licenser of musical publications. A long list of musicians participating in the Oxford concerts is mentioned by Anthony Wood, its reproduction in Hawkins's history occupying four or five pages. Wood also states that amongst the Oxford amateurs Thomas Ken "would be sometimes amongst them and sing his part". This fact one of Ken's biographers advances as "a proof that love of music overpasses religious divisions".

Lastly, incredible as it may seem, it is to that period of the Protectorate in which the Nonconformist element predominated that we are indebted for the production of the first real English opera. This work was entitled *The Siege of Rhodes,* and consisted of five acts, the libretto being written by Sir William Davenant, to whom Cromwell granted a special licence for its performance at Rutland House, Aldersgate Street, on 23rd May, 1656. Unfortunately the music, said to have been largely recitative, has disappeared. In his *Foundations of English Opera* Mr. E. J. Dent speaks of the Protectorate as "the only period at which serious opera in English, set to music all through . . . has ever enjoyed a real and supreme popularity with English audiences". Sir George Macfarren, in his paper on *The Lyrical Drama,* read before the Musical Association

on 7th June, 1880, says that "in the principal character (of *The Sieg of Rhodes*) the first female performer that was ever heard upon th English stage sustained a part—Mrs. Coleman, the wife of Dr Coleman", who, with Milton's friend, Harry Lawes, the hero of on of the poet's sonnets, composed some portion of the music. Thus says the worthy Cambridge professor, "from the Puritan time i England dates the opening of the English opera, and that very important introduction into musical performances, the beautifu sound of the female voice". In 1658 Davenant produced *Th Spaniards in Peru*, a work which was said to have been encouraged by Cromwell, "who was then supposed to be meditating some design against the Spaniards". This opera was followed, in 1659, by *Th History of Sir Francis Drake*. There was also a daily performanc of opera in London during the latter period of the Protectorate.

After the Restoration and the passing of the Act of Uniformity the iniquitous legislation embodied in such measures as the Cor poration, the Conventicle, the Five-Mile, and the Test Act prevented for nearly a century further musical developments among the Nonconformists. Liable, at first, to arrest at any moment of thei worship, they met by stealth, carefully avoiding any sounds calculated to betray the existence of an unlawful assembly. But i was during this period that we are indebted to Bunyan for the delight ful references to music in his "immortal allegory". Indeed, s great was his affection for music that he is said to have fashioned a flute out of one of the legs of a chair in Bedford jail. The exclusion of Free Churchmen from all public offices and from the Universities the death of the old leaders such as Owen and Howe, together with the narrowness of the then rising ministers, lowered the intellectua status of Nonconformity and made it unpopular with the highe classes of society. "Of Christian song, as an art, they knew littl or nothing," says Skeats: " They did sing, but only a rough an uncouth doggerel."

Nevertheless, in the midst of this political, intellectual, an artistic darkness there arose a burning and a shining light, a ma through whose labours Nonconformity was able to confer upon th worship music of this country one of the greatest benefits it has eve received. "On the day of the death of William III, Isaac Watts, the only twenty-seven years of age, was chosen to fill the pulpit of Mar Lane Chapel, London," formerly occupied by John Owen. Fiv years later (1707) Watts published his first collection of hymns, som of which had been already sung in his father's church a Southampton. His *Psalms* followed in 1719. The State Churc clung to the "dry psalter" of Tate and Brady until the middle of th last century; but "the English Independents", says Lord Selborne "as represented by Dr. Watts, have a just claim to be considered th real founders of modern hymnology". As Mr. J. T. Lightwoo

remarks, "The introduction of the hymn as a substitute for the metrical psalms, under the influence of Dr. Watts, marks the turn of the tide. The outbursts of song which characterized the Methodist movement brought in the flood."

But Watts was more than a poet, and more than a pioneer. He was an unconscious prophet. Challenged in 1696, by his father's church, to produce something better than the hymns of the Rev. W. Barton (1603-78) of which he had been complaining, Watts wrote —and his words were "lined out" and sung the same day at evening service—the hymn commencing,

> Behold the glories of the Lamb,
> Amidst His Father's throne;
> Prepare new honours for his name,
> And songs before unknown.

To this preparation of "new honours" and "songs before unknown" Watts was contributing to an extent of which he had little or no idea, for the new hymns were soon found to require special tunes. The poetical flights of Watts, and, in later years, of Wesley, could not be restricted to the metres of the old "Church Tunes" of Reformation times. Thus it came to pass that England became still further indebted to Nonconformity musically, for Nonconformist musicians contributed some of the finest of our older hymn tunes. Amongst the latter was the immortal *Miles Lane,* composed by William Shrubsole, a chorister of Canterbury Cathedral, who, in 1783, was dismissed from his post as organist of Bangor Cathedral on a charge of "frequenting conventicles". He became organist of Spa Fields Chapel in 1784, died in 1806, and was buried in Bunhill Fields where a monument, erected through the exertions of Mr. F. G. Edwards, the late editor of *The Musical Times,* marks his grave. Another composer was Isaac Smith, sometime clerk of Ayliffe Street Meeting House, London, who died about 1800, and is best known to us as the composer of *Abridge* and, perhaps, of *Irish.* Thomas Olivers (1725-1809), the profligate shoemaker of a Montgomeryshire village, a convert of Whitefield, and one of Wesley's itinerant preachers, will not only be remembered as the author of that magnificent hymn, "The God of Abraham praise," but as the composer of the melody of *Helmsley,* the tune almost inseparably joined to the Advent hymn, "Lo! He comes with clouds descending". "Holy Bible, Book divine," was written by a Congregational minister, Joseph Hart: *Hart,* to which the words are generally sung, was composed by Benjamin Milgrove (1731-1810), sometime precentor of the Countess of Huntington's Church, Bath, and known locally as "the musical doll-man" from the fact that he kept a toy-shop in his native city.

To the Unitarians we are indebted for *Warrington*—still a favourite L.M. tune with many editors and congregations—the composition of the Rev. Ralph Harrison, the minister of Cross Street

Unitarian Chapel, Manchester, from 1777 until his death in 1810. Amongst other Nonconformist musicians of this period to whose efforts we owe many hynm tunes characteristic of their time may be mentioned James Leach (1762-98), the Methodist musician of Rochdale and Salford, whose tunes were very highly esteemed by that great organ virtuoso, W. T. Best; Isaac Tucker (1761-1825), the Baptist precentor of Westbury Leigh, in Wiltshire, the composer of *Devizes;* William Arnold (1768-1832), a Portsmouth shipwright, the composer of *Sarah;* Samuel Stanley (1767-1822), of Carrs Lane and Ebenezer Chapel, Birmingham, the composer of *Shirland* and *Calvary;* the Northamptonshire Baptist, Thomas Jarman (1788-1862), the composer of *Nativity;* the Lancashire Methodist, James Ellor (*b.* 1819), the composer of *Diadem;* Thomas Clark, of Canterbury, who, in 1837, edited the *Union Tune Book,* for many years the standard book of psalmody amongst Nonconformists; and many other musicians, amongst whom we must not forget to mention George Gay, the Wiltshire stonemason (1771-1833), who, not content with building a country Congregational chapel in addition to Melksham Bridge, and acting as organist of the Congregational Church, Corsham, constructed organs, wrote poetry, composed some fine hymn tunes and some anthems (one hymn tune being in eight real parts), and acted as musical editor of *Hawkes' Tunes,* of 1832, one of the most representative collections of West country tunes known at that period, and one which cost its Methodist proprietor over £500.

Owing to the struggles and difficulties of the Nonconformist churches of the 18th and earlier part of the 19th centuries, it was not until the latter decades of the 19th that provincial Free Churches were able to secure professional leadership for their service of praise. Consequently the direction of their worship music devolved upon amateurs, many of them in comparatively humble life, as indicated in the preceding paragraph. What these practically self-taught musicians did for themselves and for others almost surpasses credence. Through their agency thousands of young people studied musical notation and part-singing, or obtained an elementary knowledge of a stringed or wind instrument sufficient to enable them to take their part in psalmody or simple anthems; while others essayed even psalmodic composition which proved to be well up to the average of their time. Thus, to the provincial Nonconformist churches of the century following the Methodist revival we are indebted for the greater part of the musical education of large numbers of the young people of that period.

The mention of elementary musical training should serve to remind us that it is to that highly esteemed Congregational minister, the Rev. John Curwen (1816-80), that we owe the establishment of that singularly simple system of sight-singing known as the Tonic

Sol-fa, to which is due a very large portion of any credit we may now possess as a nation of sight singers and expert choralists. Nor should we forget the efforts made by a blind Congregational minister, John James Waite (*d.* 1868) whose sight-singing systems by means of numbers, although superseded by that of Curwen, did much good work in a more limited sphere. Waite's tune book, the *Hallelujah* (1842), was originally edited by James Foster, organist of Whitefield's Tabernacle, Bristol. To it we are indebted for the first appearance of Foster's fine tune, *Pembroke.*

This leads us naturally to our next claim for Nonconformity musically, namely, that to it we are beholden for some of the most interesting and valuable collections of hymn tunes ever published in this country. Those of Hawkes and Waite have already been mentioned; but an earlier Nonconformist tune-book was Dr. Rippon's *Selection of Psalm and Hymn Tunes* of 1795, the 13th edition of which appeared in 1820. That Dr. Rippon (1751-1836) was a Baptist minister is well known; but it is not so well known that his "selection" was the first attempt to find tunes for Dr. Watts's *Hymns* and *Psalms,* and that it was probably the first book of its kind to have marks of expression inserted in the music. Another interesting method of expressing psalmodic tone gradation was that featured by the Rev. John Curwen in his *Sabbath Hymn Book* of 1859. Here the lines supposed to demand a larger tone in their musical rendering were printed in capital letters; the supposed softer passages, in italics. After the *Union Tune Book,* already mentioned, came Dr. Allon's *Congregational Psalmist,* the *Bristol Tune Book, Church Praise,* the *Congregational Church Hymnal,* the Rev. Garrett Horder's *Worship Song,* and last of all, and probably the best, the *Congregational Hymnary.* This is a lengthy list, but it lacks the redeeming virtue of a catalogue in that it is by no means complete. Indeed it only refers to a portion, considerable though it may be, of the hymnals for which we are indebted to Nonconformists.

If it is denominationally correct to speak of Surrey Chapel, during the ministry of the Rev. Rowland Hill, as a Nonconformist place of worship, we can then claim for Nonconformity the credit of the establishment (if not the inauguration) of organ recitals in this country, together with the first presentation of Bach's organ works to an English audience. This took place in 1808, when the organist of Surrey Chapel, Shrubsole's pupil, Benjamin Jacob (1778-1829), in his day one of the most celebrated English organists, began a series of organ "performances" which commenced at 11 a.m. and lasted for four hours. In these efforts he was assisted by Dr. Crotch and, more especially, by Samuel Wesley, the son of Charles Wesley, the poet, and the father of Dr. S. S. Wesley, the celebrated cathedral organist and church composer. At these "recitals" many of Bach's works were heard for the first time in England; and with reference

thereto a remarkable series of letters was written by Wesley to Jacob, in one of which Wesley speaks of being grateful to Rowland Hill for granting the use of the building and of thinking him (Wesley) worthy to be joint organist with Jacob. The attention attracted to Bach's works by these performances and the part Rowland Hill and his people played in rendering the recitals possible are matters of interest and importance to all English organists and students of musical history.

Then, in addition to organ music and performances, Englishmen are indebted to Free Church generosity and enterprise for some of the finest organs to be found in this country, as can easily be demonstrated by reference to the specifications of Nonconformist organs to be found in the pages of musical journals of recent date. The same applies to organ recitals. Indeed, Mr. F. G. Edwards has shewn that it was at Union Chapel, Islington, on 4th December, 1867, that the expression "organ recital" was substituted for the more cumbersome one of "organ performance", the performer on that occasion being no less a personage than W. T. Best himself.

Nor is this country indebted to Nonconformity for musical *material* alone. The Free Churches have provided *men,* her "chief musicians"—in addition to those already mentioned—including the names of hundreds of organists, choirmasters, composers, conductors, and teachers of fully recognized ability. For instance, as editors we have Mr. Josiah Booth, the editor of the *Congregational Church Hymnal* and of the chant, anthem, and service section of the *Bristol Tune Book;* Mr. Arthur Berridge, the editor of *Worship Song;* the late Mr. F. G. Edwards, the editor of *Church Praise,* and also of *The Musical Times;* his successor, the late Dr. McNaught, the great choral adjudicator; Mr. Ebenezer Minshall, the founder and editor of *The Musical Journal;* and Mr. J. Spencer Curwen, sometime editor of *The Musical Herald.* Then, as theorists, we have Professor Prout, in his day one of the foremost theorists in Europe or America; and the late Mr. Henry Banister who, up to the time of his death, was the deacon of a Nonconformist church and an occasional local preacher, his grandfather, C. W. Banister (1768–1831) having been the precentor of a London Baptist church and a composer still remembered by his stirring hymn tune, *Dunkirk,* and by his once favourite anthem, *Avon,* a setting of Toplady's lines, "At anchor laid, remote from home".

A further musical indebtedness to Nonconformity is in the direction of Free Church musical and choral societies, such as the Nonconformist Choir Union and the various Nonconformist choral organizations, which are to be found in every town or district of importance throughout the country. In this connexion should be mentioned the fact that one of the greatest choral conductors and adjudicators of recent years, Sir Henry Coward, is a lifelong Non-

conformist and Free Church official. Further, we are indebted to the Free Churches for, practically, the establishment of the mixed choir and, certainly, for its continuance. However much other denominations may divide the sexes, the Free Churches are, and should always be, too chivalrous to exclude women from their choirs or to assign them a subordinate position therein, and too artistic to ignore so beautiful and characteristic a musical effect as that produced by the female voice singly or in combination. Indeed, much of the success of our best choral societies, festival choruses, and competition choirs is due to the presence therein of choralists trained under Free Church auspices. If these contingents were withdrawn the loss in volume and effect would be, to say the least, lamentable.

Lastly, if congregational singing is to be regarded as a musical desideratum, then great indeed is our indebtedness to Nonconformity in this respect. For the importance of united praise was proclaimed by those fathers of Congregationalism, Ainsworth and Robinson; was encouraged by Baxter, the Presbyterian, by Keach, the Baptist, by the founder of Methodism, and by many other Nonconformist divines; and was established by the labours of such men as Wesley, Smith, Rippon, Allon, Curwen, Feaston, Minshall, and many other Free Church musical writers and musicians both past and present.

In fact so much could be said concerning our stated subject that this article could easily be expanded into a volume. Sufficient, however, has been set down, not in the nature of propaganda but in the interests of authentic musical history, to show that no one who claims any adequate knowledge of the latter subject can venture to assert that Nonconformity has had no lot or part whatever in the building up of the musical life of the nation. On the contrary, even this imperfect survey should be equal to the task of demonstrating that Nonconformity's share in England's musical life has been neither inconsiderable nor immaterial. This being admitted, it follows that if our Nonconformist musical ancestors, labouring under almost indescribable difficulties and discouragements, produced such wonderful results musically and left so fine a record upon the pages of musical history, the least that can be expected of their present day representatives is that they should not be stationary but go forward, as John Robinson, the pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers once expressed it, "further than the instruments of our reformation," always remembering that musically as well as spiritually "unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more".

ORLANDO A. MANSFIELD.

"JESUS NAZARENUS."

A LARGE number of books have been written, and we suppose will continue to be written, upon what Jesus said or did, or upon what Jesus was, according to the situation or inclination of the author—but few about Jesus. Lives of Jesus have also been many, but few have suited the minds of the common people who heard Him gladly. They have been rather "introductions" to Jesus. As an occasional event, a story of the Cross has been a best seller, but none has remained. *The Pilgrim's Progress,* which is about the Lord of the Hill, defies the fate of its competitors. The modern age would gladly receive a book about Jesus. Whatever priest or minister might say, each man has his own secret thoughts about Him and also his own portrait; there is nothing, in fact, that he has which is so specifically his own. Men would, however, welcome the artist who would do for them what the author of the Fourth Gospel did for the lovers of Jesus in the second century or what the author of the *Imitation* did for his own romantic age, or what the author of the *Hebrews* did for his friends who found vision and faith fading. These all wrote about Jesus, but the one followed Him into the camp of His bitterest enemies, the other followed, to use his own words, " to the ignominy of His Cross," and who can tell what awaited the author who dared to write about a High Priest who can be touched with the feelings of our infirmities, or about Jesus as the author and perfecter of faith?

Yet, perhaps the greatness of the task, and the danger it presupposes, accounts for the fact that few write about Jesus. History records the fate of a young man of twenty-four, David Friedrich Strauss, who ventured to write about Him, and against whom the heavy artillery of men less brave than he was quickly ranged. No one seeks his fate, though it might do the Church good if some brave and peerless soul would write about Jesus, if he would give us his own thoughts and would speak out of his own feelings. It might endanger, in the minds of the fearful, the safety of the citadel of faith, but then men might be enticed away from discussing accessories, secondaries, "Orders of Service," and such questions as " if Christ came to London "; and in the war of words and countless theories that might follow some would find that the great thing after all is the desire to see Jesus, a request as old as the coming of the Greeks. The sure and certain fact would be that a book about Jesus would say so many disturbing things that the author could not escape an encircling attack; for we should find him reminding us that no distinctions that men seek after were found in Him, that He came from a despised northern village, that He was a Galilean, from which province no prophet ever came, and quite likely spoke with "an accent."

In any books of this kind and nature, whatever their tincture of orthodoxy might be, there would be one piece of solid and sure ground common to all; they would agree that nothing matters save Jesus, Jesus only. The story of Jesus of Nazareth we have wants us to know this very thing. It relates why God sent His Son, and sent Him to a people that was despised and rejected of men, a people of sorrows and acquainted with grief. This people was chosen out of all the greater peoples of the world. He sent Him to the north into a working man's family. He never possessed any adornment, any robe of office. When He died, He died as a malefactor among malefactors, and "a seamless robe " was the only possession over which there was any danger of a dispute amongst the soldiers as to who should possess it. This surely means that God meant that nothing was of greater moment than Jesus Himself, and so planned His mission that the simplest mind should make no mistake. Nothing in after years remained so vividly in the memory of three of the disciples as that occasion when, " lifting up their eyes, they saw no one, save Jesus only." Their companions in fellowship with Jesus were at the same time occupied with a very mundane question; similar questions remain and to many are of grave and great importance.

The question then is whether this age has not lost Jesus of Nazareth, and so lost the heart of God. Something like this loss can be detected in the names we accept from tradition, names which He Himself would most likely have challenged. We call Him " Prince," but He was one of the brethren; we make Him a King, an honour He was careful to evade; we have made Him a High Priest, whereas He regarded Himself as a servant. The mistake is that we read into these names meanings which are our own, and not in keeping with Him Who proclaimed the Beatitudes. Is this procedure, however, part of a conspiracy to lift Jesus out of the humbler surroundings and circumstances into which He was sent, out of the perfectly natural atmosphere in which He lived? The aim of such a conspiracy would doubtless be that He might find favour with kings, emperors, and popes, and, further, to justify those who seek the favours and honours of the world. That is, men have attempted to lift Jesus up to man's own level of social eminence and ambition rather than that men should humble themselves and descend to where He stands. But He persists in remaining the Nazarene. So we have lost Him.

The coming event then may well be the re-discovery of Jesus of Nazareth. The world might appear to many as being prepared for this great event. The decline is not in an appreciation of religion, but in a loss of confidence in the modern organized forms of religion. The Church, with its many sections, has argued itself into an impasse from which there seems at present no escape except by retreat. In the confusion of claims some are sighing for a Francis to show us in

life the art of true living; some for a Fénelon "who in the ante chamber of despotic power meditated upon the institutions of liberty and though destined to improve courts and instruct monarchs, desire only to civilize savages in the solitudes around Lake Huron." Other look for someone who will do what Luther did for his century, thoug he must commence with a different thesis, and one equal to the expec tations of our day, namely, "the freedom with which Christ sets u free." This is the very heart of the Gospel. It is very hard, how ever, to admit that "our systems," built up with such labour an fortitude of faith, must eventually pass. But the counterpart is see in looking over a theological library that is fifty years old. The book have passed. Yet what labour they represent, how eagerly they wer read, one here or there was a great event. So must pass ou opinions, our doctrines, even our creeds; but Jesus of Nazareth wil remain.

The retreat then would be along our individual path back to Hi from Whom we set out. The quest of Jesus of Nazareth has still charm for many minds, and when man's understanding has bee fully granted its freedom, the writer about Jesus will arrive. S many things have been said, so many schemes of salvation have bee advanced, so many sermons have been preached about how to becom a follower of Jesus, but little, after centuries, has been attained o clear and lasting success, and recently a great shattering has take place. It is high time now bravely to speak about Jesus, the autho and finisher of the faith that alone will save the world. One thin the coming prophet will surely speak to his age. He will try, amon other things, to tell us what it feels like to be a Christian, to posses that spirit which makes men free. The apostle who had known wha it felt like to be alive apart from the law, and what it felt like to b a Pharisee, told his hearers what it felt like to be a Christian; he ha one text and that was a text about Jesus; he preached Christ and Hi crucified. "We live in thoughts and feelings," says W. H. Hudson it is surely true. Mr. Masefield in *The Everlasting Mercy* has beau tifully expressed this experience of what it feels like to be a Christia and seems in fact to suggest that he who will write about Jesus wi be a poet:—

O lovely lily clean,
O lily springing green,
O lily bursting white,
Dear lily of delight,
Spring in my heart agen
That I may flower to men.

C. Morell Bainton.

THE LAST SUPPER.

Paul in *I Cor.* 11 23-26.	*Mark* 14 22-25	*Luke* 22 15-20.	*John.*
(23) For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; (24) and when he had given thanks he brake it and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. (25) In like manner also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. (26) For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.	(22) And as they were eating he took bread, and when he had blessed he brake it and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body. (23) And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave to them: and they all drank of it. (24) And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many. (25) Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God.	(15) And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: (16) for I say unto you, I will not eat it until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God. (17) And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, Take this and divide it among yourselves: (18) for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the Kingdom of God shall come. (19) *And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it and gave to them, saying, This is my body [which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me.* (20) *And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you*]1.	*John* xiii (1) Now before the feast of the passover, Jesus knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end. (2) And during supper (then follows the story of the feet-washing, without allusion to the bread and wine). *John* vi (51) I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; yea, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world. (52) The Jews therefore strove one with another, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? (53) Jesus therefore said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves . . . . . (63) It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life.

1 The "Western" Text (Codex Bezae and the Old Latin) omits passage in square brackets.

MANY volumes have been written concerning the meal shared by our Lord with His disciples on the night of His betrayal, which in Christian tradition marks the initiation of the Church's most solemn rite. The words and acts ascribed to Jesus have been examined with the utmost minuteness, and pondered with the most scrupulous care. Yet, after all, there is divergence among students as to what actually took place, and what were the thoughts and intentions of the Master. The traditional view of this great historic moment is by no means universally accepted; and perhaps there is room for a layman's humble attempt to survey afresh the existing evidence.

I.

There appear to be four sources of information, largely independent of one another, which are set out above in parallel columns. They are the accounts given by Paul, by *Mark*, by *Luke*, and by the author of the fourth Gospel. That in the first Gospel is not here

printed, being an almost literal reproduction of the story containe in *Mark*.

Before I proceed to compare them with one another there is preliminary question to be considered, because the interpretation o the passages depends in part on the answer we give to it. *Was thi meal a Passover?* The Synoptists write as if they thought it was Jesus sends two of His disciples to "make ready the passover".[1] Bu it is well known that a number of their statements appear inconsisten with this view—*e.g.*, the Sanhedrin had determined to arrest Hi and get Him put to death *before* the "feast"[2]—and that the fourt Gospel consistently places the Supper on the day before the pass over, making the latter coincide with the death of Jesus. On th whole, I incline to the view suggested by Prof. F. C. Burkitt (an perhaps others) that Jesus intended, and earnestly desired,[3] to cele brate the passover with His disciples, but found that owing to th treachery of Judas He would not be left at liberty to do so. Ther was time, however, for a farewell supper, and this opportunity H eagerly seized, anticipating by one day the regular celebration. I this is probably true, we need not seek to explain His words and act by supposing that they would accord minutely with the pascha ritual; and no use will be made of this in what follows.

Our two chief authorities for what occurred at the Supper ar Paul and *Mark*. Paul introduces his narrative by saying that h "received" it "of the Lord". No one, I think, has explained satis factorily what he means by this. If he is claiming a direct revelatio to himself of a fact in history, this would be unique in his recorde experience; and even so we might still be doubtful whether he re membered it correctly in every detail. It seems to me more likel that he is giving to the Corinthian Church the Christian tradition a he had received it, and supporting it by what to him is an inwar intuition of its truth.[4] Neither he nor Mark can have been presen at the Supper; but Mark's Gospel is commonly believed to hav rested in part on the recollections of Peter, who certainly was there The two authorities agree about the bread: that Jesus, after a solem thanksgiving, broke a loaf and gave portions to the disciples wit the words "This is my body". They also agree about the cup: wit minor divergencies of phrasing both authorities give us, in referenc to its contents, the words "my blood", and "the (new) covenant" Where they differ is in Paul's twice repeated "this do", which doe not appear in *Mark* at all—a very important divergence, needin further consideration. They also differ widely in the words tha

1 *Mk.* 14$^{12\text{-}16}$. 2 *Mk.* 14^{1f}. 3 *Luke* 22^{15}.

4 Compare his παρέλαβον and παρέδωκα with the same words i 1. *Cor.* 15^{3}: "I delivered unto you that which also I received, how that Christ die for our sins according to the Scriptures."

follow, the only common feature being an eschatological outlook: "till He come" in Paul, the proximity of "the kingdom of God" in *Mark*.

The chief difficulty of the passage in *Luke* is to know how much is original. All the words after "This is my body" are omitted by the "Western" text of *Luke*, and Westcott and Hort left them out of their text. These words (*i.e.*, verses 19b and 20), containing the only "this do" in the Gospels, have apparently been inserted from 1 *Cor.* 11^{24f} (conceivably by Luke himself, in a later edition of his Gospel); and if that is their source they do not give us *independent* support of Paul's version of what occurred. But, if these portions are omitted, it is not easy for 19a to stand. The mention of the bread then looks like an after-thought, and "this is my body" remains isolated, without logical connexion with preceding or following verses. So that we may be compelled, with Wellhausen, to strike it also out of the original *Luke*. Without it, verses 15-18 form a compact whole, a striking version of the occurrence different from either Paul's or *Mark's*, which (according to Streeter[1]) Luke derived from his original source, "Proto-Luke". It is markedly eschatological in character—the general significance being that Jesus, knowing it is now too late to share the passover meal with His disciples, looks forward with confidence to the ideal Messianic banquet in the Kingdom which is close at hand. The passage, thus restricted, contains no mention either of the body or of the blood of Jesus; yet it is full of anticipation of His immediate death.

The fourth Gospel goes further than "Proto-Luke", and omits all mention of the bread and wine. Instead of this we are told that "during supper" (which the author is at pains to say took place "before the feast") Jesus washes the disciples' feet. This may well be historical, and is possibly alluded to in *Luke* 22^{27}, "I am in the midst of you as he that serveth". The omission of the Eucharist seems inexplicable, unless the author wished in this way to combat views concerning it which were already gaining ground in the Church, and of which he disapproved. That its symbolism deeply appealed to him is clear from the discourse which in c. 6 he puts into the mouth of Jesus, concerning the Bread of Life. The words about eating the flesh of the Son of man and drinking His blood must be later than Jesus,[2] and can only have been suggested by the experience of the Church. Yet it is impossible to suppose that the author is insisting on the importance of the sacramental rite—especially in view of his omission of the institution. Rather, he takes the observance for granted, and (consistently with his main purpose in writing the

1 *The Four Gospels*, 216.

2 Could He possibly have uttered such words publicly, "in the synagogue at Capernaum", in face of the horror of His hearers at the idea of eating human flesh, and that with which all Jews regarded the drinking of any blood?

Gospel) puts the whole emphasis on its spiritual significance: "It
the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing". Not th
ceremony itself, but what it means, is to his mind all-important.

II.

Having thus glanced at the evidence, we proceed to its interpret
tion. This is by no means easy. Paul was doubtless voicing th
general view of the Christians of his time, reporting that which h
"received", when he represented Jesus as establishing a ceremon
for observance in His Church until His return in glory—
"proclamation", or symbolic re-enactment, of His death for me
Yet some of the foremost Protestant scholars, examining the Gospe
with minds free from traditional preconceptions, judge it to be u
likely that Jesus ever definitely envisaged a society of His followe
separate from the Jewish Church, or gave any thought to i
organization. If He did not, He can hardly have intended to estab
lish a ceremony. And, as was said above, it is Paul alone who repor
the words "this do". The Marcan story does not *disprove* that
rite was instituted; but such an interpretation does not naturall
arise, it has to be "read in". If we take that story as it stands, di
regarding for the moment Paul's account, what it suggests to us
that the mind of Jesus was mainly occupied with the terrible cris
which He saw close at hand, and with its effects upon the disciple
The traitor had left the party to carry through his dreadful bargai
with the priests; on that very night He Himself would probably b
seized and carried off for execution. The Shepherd would b
smitten and the sheep would be scattered. Unnerved with terro
His foremost disciple would deny Him. How then could the Kingdo
come? How could His life-work be anything but a tragic failure
The shadows of Gethsemane were gathering fast about His spiri
How could those poor feeble souls, who had not yet been able
contemplate the possibility of their Master's death, carry on H
work without Him? How could they possibly, when deprived
His leadership, bring to a triumphant harvest the Kingdom that H
had only begun to implant in their hearts? Only, if He could bin
them to Himself in a bond of fellowship and love so strong that eve
His death should not have power to break it. This farewell me
gave Him the opportunity He needed. No bond of comradeshi
between men in that ancient world was stronger than that of eatin
and drinking together; and the sacrificial system was believed
establish a similar tie of fellowship between man and his God. Th
language of sacrifice used by Jesus was therefore exactly appropriate
it supplied what He needed to give the act its supreme impressiv
ness, and at the same time to enable Him to impart to them some
His deepest thoughts concerning His death. He Himself was n

only a party to the covenant, He was the victim also, whose life would shortly be forfeit. And, as the "blood of the covenant", sprinkled on the people in the ancient ritual,[1] assured them of acceptance and communion with God, so the shedding of His own blood would be the means of winning "many" into the Kingdom. The faith of Jesus rises triumphant over His anxiety and dread. Not in spite of His death, but by means of it, the Kingdom would yet be established, and He Himself would drink its new wine at the Messianic feast.[2]

The natural interpretation of *Mark's* story of the Supper, therefore, would make it the supreme moment in the relation of Jesus to His immediate disciples, in which He was able so to impress them with His own spirit as to ensure that His death, far from putting an end to the hope of the Kingdom, would be the very means through which He would achieve it. In this way He was able to regard the coming Cross, though brought about by the wickedness of men, as capable of being turned, by dedication and obedience, to the fulfilment of the Divine purpose. Had men's hearts been less hard, and their eyes less blind, some other means than the sacrifice of God's own Son might have availed for human redemption. But, if this bitter cup must be drunk, He would not flinch. The last Supper, therefore, even if no rite was instituted, seems to lose nothing of its supreme appeal to all that is deepest in the human heart; and its observance in the Church has undoubtedly helped to carry that appeal down the centuries.

The fragment about the Supper preserved in the original *Luke* (22^{15-18}), while almost certainly an independent narrative, does little more than expand the striking eschatological passage in *Mark* (14^{25}). It shows the faith of Jesus triumphant over death: faith that, in spite of the coming tragedy, the Kingdom is close at hand. There is in these verses none of the language of sacrifice, and nothing to suggest a memorial of His death. He seems to be trying to share with His disciples His own assurance of victory.

We see then that the Gospels, critically examined, present indications that the common view of the Church (including Paul) of the institution of the Eucharistic rite by our Lord Himself was not universally held. It is difficult to believe that the Synoptists, had they shared that view, could have omitted "this do", or that "*John*", in his story of the Supper, could have ignored it altogether. I am leaving unanswered the question how, if the words of institution were never uttered by Jesus, the belief in them arose and spread. So far as I am aware, evidence is lacking. What we gather from scanty references in *Acts* is that in its earliest form the Eucharist was a common meal or "breaking of bread" together.[3] We find evidence

1 *Ex.* 24^{8}. 2 *Matt.* alone (26^{29}) has "with you".

3 *Acts* 2^{46}, 20^{7}, *etc.*

outside the New Testament that this Agape or love-feast was lon continued in immediate connexion with the solemn rite, but that was afterwards separated and finally forbidden as profane. It seem to have been Paul who started the process of separation, on th ground that the meal as practised at Corinth led to disorder. H probably heightened the mystical thoughts attached to the rite b his language about the body and blood of Christ—which certainl gives some colour to the "Catholic" interpretation.[1] The expressio of Jesus, as reported in *Mark*, do not go beyond a lofty symbolism "This bread represents my body; this cup stands for the blood of th covenant, which is shed for many". Had it not been for Paul words, it is questionable whether the idea of transubstantiation woul ever have arisen in the Church.

There is one question that has often been asked, which shou not be wholly passed over. *Did Jesus Himself* eat the bread an drink the wine with His disciples? The narratives are not explici and we are left to inference. Interpreters who press the idea sacrifice are inclined to conclude that He did not; others wh emphasize the side of communion suggest that He did. The "n more" (οὐκέτι) of *Mk.* 14[25] is most naturally taken to mean that H had just drunk—for the last time in this world. As has been note above, the ideas of communion and of sacrifice were closely blended and if Jesus felt Himself to be ideally the victim as well as one of th parties to the covenant, I do not think we should press the argume that He could not partake of that which represented Himself. B as to this we may be content to rest in uncertainty.

The question whether (or to what extent) the Eucharistic practi in the Church took form from the rites of the pagan Mysteries hard arises here. Our subject is the Last Supper, and all the existin accounts of it seem to be too early for their thought or language have been so influenced. Besides, devout Palestinian Jews lived a little world of their own, and looked with disfavour on the attemp of some of their countrymen to live like the Gentiles around them Paul sharply contrasts "the table of the Lord" with what he cal "the table of demons".[2] The influence may possibly be reflected some extent in the language of *John* 6[51ff]; but it can hardly have bee powerful till after the first century, when Christianity was spreadin rapidly throughout the Roman world. Primitive thoughts about th Supper, and about the communion it symbolized, seem to find the explanation (so far as this can be found) in Jewish religion.

I trust that this study, however imperfect, is on sound historic lines, and that there has been no attempt to twist the facts to suit particular theory or practice. If so, it would seem that we must

1 *I Cor.* 10[16], 11[27], *etc.*

2 *I* Cor. 10[21].

least leave open the question whether the Eucharistic ceremony can be traced to the mind of Jesus Himself, or whether the Church's authority is all we can claim for it. The practical outcome would seem to be that its observance must in future be based on grounds of expediency, rather than of obedience to a command of our Lord. So far as it is found to minister to the deepest needs of the Christian life, to bind the followers of Jesus in deathless bonds to Himself, to make the Cross a living experience, and to energize their lives by His indwelling Spirit, it will continue to be observed in His universal Church. But in that Church, as its separated branches come into closer union, a place must be found for those who believe they reach the reality without the symbol. Even by the World Conference on Faith and Order, held at Lausanne in 1927, it was recognized that there are those "who, while attaching high value to the sacramental principle, do not make use of the outward signs of Sacraments, but hold that all spiritual benefits are given through immediate contact with God through His Spirit".

EDWARD GRUBB.

HOW TO CONSIDER A CALL.

R. W. DALE AS EXEMPLAR.

In 1871, when the Clapton Park Congregational Church was movin from the Old Gravel Pit Chapel to the spacious "Round Chapel where it now worships, its minister, Dr. James Spence, was compelle to resign the pastorate, his heart not being equal to the strain c preaching in the new building. In accordance with the church' custom the deacons called together the heads of families, who voted 37 for and 5 against, a resolution, subsequently carried by 114 to 1 at a church meeting and 158 to 6 at the statutory meeting, callin R. W. Dale to the pastorate.

The ensuing correspondence is characteristic of Dale, and may b welcome in this his centenary year : it has not been printed previously In its seriousness and in its tactfulness it is indeed a model fo ministers. The church's letter of invitation, signed by eight deacons may serve as an introduction to Dale's letters, which are addressed the first four to James Carter, the fifth to the church, and the last tw to Henry Child. Mr. Carter and Mr. Child were deacons, and bot were grandfathers of the Rev. Henry Child Carter, of Cambridge The first letter is written from 55 Bristol Road, Birmingham, the res from Field Side, Grasmere.

For the Birmingham and Carrs Lane attitude to the invitation, se A. W. W. Dale's *R. W. Dale,* pp. 299, ff.

The Church's Letter of Invitation (21st July, 1871).

Though no formal communication has yet been made to you, yet w are conscious such rumours must have reached you as will prevent thi letter taking you by surprise.

Since the final retirement of our late respected pastor, Dr. Spence, o 24th June last, we have taken pains to learn the sentiments and wishes c our church as to the choice of a successor, and the preliminary steps th deacons have taken have led to the adoption of a resolution passed at special Church Meeting last evening to the following purport :

> " That the Church hereby choose the Rev. R. W. Dale, M.A., c Birmingham, as its pastor, and request the deacons to invite hi accordingly."

We therefore, dear sir, would urge this resolution on your consideration and fervently desire, with submission to Him Who rules all hearts, tha you may decide to accept it.

The migration of our flock from the narrow fold at the Old Gravel P to the broader one of Clapton Park Chapel has much enlarged the spher of action in which as a church we deem it our duty to move. Among ou families numbers of young people are growing up who are the hopes c the succeeding age. For them we seek a pastor whose wise and affection ate private counsels, added to the instructions of the pulpit, may guid them in the paths of Scriptural piety. While for the populous and in creasing neighbourhood around us we desire a tender, though powerfu

and manly, exhibition of Gospel truth to win their hearts to Christ. Now, dear Sir, for this purpose we turn our thoughts to you, and in the name, and by the almost unanimous voice of our church, we hereby invite you to become our pastor.

We joyfully acknowledge and would give thanks to God for the success which has attended your course and labours in Birmingham, and if we feared that your acceptance of the pastorship would narrow your opportunities of usefulness as a Christian minister it would not become us to urge it. But we think you would find it otherwise, and that the scope for active and vigorous pastoral labour would yield you full employment and heart-felt pleasure. May we therefore request a confidential interview with yourself, either by a deputation waiting on you when and where you may appoint, or by your visiting the house of one of our brethren where all could meet you?

At such time every circumstance important shall be faithfully laid before you to guide your decision.

Praying for the divine guidance of you and us.

DALE'S LETTERS.

I (July 22, 71—Saturday night).

Your letter reached me this afternoon.

My brain is weary with the strain of nearly eleven months of almost unintermitted work. I have to preach twice to-morrow, and have the additional anxiety of having to communicate to my deacons the fact that an invitation has reached me from Clapton. On Monday I have to give the charge at a Missionary ordination.

I feel that I must have a day or two's quiet before even looking at this grave question, and therefore, I shall not disturb the arrangements which I had made before I received your communication, to go to Grasmere on Tuesday.

There are several things which I should like to know even before settling an interview, but of these I will write from Grasmere.

It is a singular coincidence that it is just nine years ago since I had any very serious thought of leaving Birmingham, and then a proposal which was laid before me to go out to Melbourne and which very strongly attracted me, reached me just as I was starting for Rydal, and I thought it all over among the same hills which will, I hope, be round about me on Tuesday night.

Give my very kind regards to your brethren in office.

II (July 26, 1871—Wednesday).

In the hasty note which I wrote to you on Saturday evening I said that there were one or two points on which I should be glad to have information before arranging for an interview.

Will you be good enough to let me know (1) the number of persons in Church-membership and having votes at the Church meeting; (2) the number that voted for the Resolution which you have forwarded me; (3) the number that were neutral and that voted against it.

If there are any facts, which you can communicate by letter and which you think I ought to know, I shall be glad to receive them. I feel at present too weary to make the effort necessary to look the question fairly in the face; but in a day or two I shall doubtless be all right.

III (July 30, 71).

I am very much obliged to you for the explicit information contained in your letter.

It is clear that the number of votes given for the invitation does not reach one half of the number of members in fellowship,[1] and though large deductions are properly made for the aged, the sick, and persons absent from home, I cannot very well resist the impression that, if there is no strength of hostility to the invitation, there is no general eagerness in its support.

This impression is so strong as to constitute an almost adequate reason for declining the further consideration of the question; for even if a unanimous and earnest invitation had reached me, I should have been compelled to think long and earnestly before surrendering the position of usefulness and comfort which I have at Carrs Lane.

It is due, however, to the church at Clapton that I should fairly consider what can be urged in consideration[2] on the other side.

I will, therefore, arrange to meet a deputation from the diaconate somewhere between here and London, unless indeed the deputation think that a day among these pleasant hills would compensate them for the long journey.

The most convenient point of meeting between here and London would be at Crewe. A train leaves Dalston at 8.30 in the morning and reaches Crewe at 1.5 :—a train leaves Crewe at 5.20 and professes to reach Dalston at 9.35. I could leave here at 8 and be at Crewe at 1.12—and a train at 4.10 would bring me back here the same night. As I am here holiday making, one day would be as convenient to me as another, except that if the Crewe arrangement is preferred, I should be glad to have it on any other day than next Thursday, when I am expecting two of my children to arrive.

Our post does not come in till too late for me to catch the early train from Windermere, so that I should be glad to have two days' notice.

I shall be very thankful to see clear light on this matter :—my conviction is that light comes when the hour for decision arrives.

IV (Aug. 4, 71).

It is very kind of the brethren to undertake so long a journey to meet me.

I think that it will be best for me to come over to Windermere on Tuesday morning; I can get there sooner than you can get here, and our lodgings here are so small that I could hardly receive the deputation as I should like to receive them.

I take it for granted that they will stay at *Rigg's*—the Railway Hotel and I will be with them soon after nine o'clock.

It would be well that the deputation should write or telegraph to Mr Rigg saying what number of beds they will require on Monday night :—the Hotel is sometimes very full. My Carrs Lane friends will be coming up a day or two after, and I earnestly hope that I may be able to arrive at a decision before the end of the week.

[1] 470 at the end of 1870.

[2] Word difficult to read.

V (August 10th, 1871).

My dear Friends,

After prolonged and anxious consideration of the resolution adopted at your church meeting on July 20th last inviting me to become your pastor, I have concluded that it is my duty to remain in Birmingham. The honourable traditions of your church, its unbroken peace through a history of nearly 70 years, its evangelistic activity, the intelligence and devoutness which I believe distinguish its members, and the great opportunity afforded by your new chapel for the preaching of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, constitute inducements to accept the pastorate which few ministers would find it easy to resist. To myself, the pastorate of Clapton Park had a special and still stronger attraction. For years I have been longing to be released, if it were God's will, from the strain of public work of many kinds in which I feel bound to engage as long as I remain in my present position—work in which I have the deepest interest and which I believe to be intimately associated with the triumphs of the Kingdom of Christ, but which necessarily absorbs much of the time and strength which a minister would prefer to devote to solitary thought and to the service of the church.

Your invitation seemed to me to offer an opportunity of living a life of less excitement and of greater quietness than is possible to me in Birmingham, but after great hesitation, I have arrived at the conclusion that I ought to decline it.

I thank you, from my very heart, for the great honour you have done me in offering to place in my hands so grave a trust and shall earnestly pray that you may very soon secure a minister more worthy of your confidence than myself, with a deeper knowledge of the Will of God and a larger measure of the Spirit of Christ. It would not be right for me to close this letter without expressing my affection and cordial gratitude for the singular kindness and consideration which have been shown to me by your deacons. If it is not presumptuous for me to speak of men, several of whom were in Christ before I was born, I trust that they will allow me to say that my brief intercourse with them has given me a strong conviction that their practical sagacity, their generous spirit and their Christian earnestness will greatly lighten the anxieties and labours of your future pastor.

I am, my dear friends,

Yours very faithfully,

R. W. Dale.

VI (Aug. 11, 71).

My reply to the Clapton Park invitation will be sent to Mr. Carter by this evening's Post.

Into the reasons which have at last brought me to the conclusion that I ought to remain where I am I cannot enter at length. The pressure which has been brought to bear upon me is such that hardly any man could resist. My own people, with an enthusiasm of unanimity implore me to remain with them;—the Church and Congregation—the Ladies—the Sunday School Teachers—all appeal to me separately, and I have been inundated with private letters, filled with affection and grief. The Pastors and Deacons of the Independent and Baptist Churches have held a special meeting to urge me to stay. Two of the Independent Churches have done

the same. Organizations of working men altogether unconnected wit any religious community and with which I have had no special relation have sent me resolutions to the same effect. An Address has also been ser to me signed by a large number of the Magistrates, members of the Co poration, and other leaders of the Liberal Party in Birmingham—includ ing professional men; the recognized representatives of the workin classes—and even two clergymen, who although they say they are n "Liberals" wish to unite in the address. What has affected me mos deeply is that I have received assurance after assurance of the spiritu benefit which has been received through God's blessing on my Ministry about the success of which I have sometimes very gloomy and despondin thoughts.

I earnestly hope that the negotiations will do nothing to interfere wit the early and harmonious election of a Pastor at Clapton Park—whos ministry shall prove that in reference to the Pastorate as in reference to s many other things, "second thoughts are best".

Accept my very cordial thanks for your own kindness to me and eve believe me to remain [&c.].

VII (Aug. 21, 71).

I know not how to thank you either for the Resolution[1] which you hav been good enough to forward to me or for the letter which accompanie it; both are most kind and generous. My great anxiety now is that th time which has been consumed in negotiating with me may prove not t have been lost. I shall never cease to be grateful for the manner in whic the Clapton Park Church has treated me, and shall have the greates possible pleasure in rendering it any slight service that may be in m power.

ALBERT PEEL.

1 The resolution, passed at a Church Meeting, on 17th August, reads:

"That this meeting has heard with deep regret the intimation that t Revd. R. W. Dale, M.A., cannot yield to the invitation of this Church to beco its pastor; the acceptance of which they had looked forward to with large expec tions of happy and prolonged usefulness. This meeting cannot, however, suffer present opportunity to pass without giving expression to their high appreciat of the honourable and sacred principles which have governed Mr. Dale in decision on this important occasion; and, while they have reason to mourn o their disappointment, they are pleased to know that the result will gladden hearts of many in Birmingham. They moreover cherish the full belief that it been wrought out by the interposition of the Divine Head of the Church who thus made known His will that His servant should remain in the place where commenced his ministry as a Pastor, and where the evidence of his efficiency success is so abundant. May he continue to advance, and may the work of Lord still prosper in his hand!"

THE HAND.

Who dreamed the hand, by which the first men wrought
Rough flints to some crude semblance of their thought
—With god-like perseverance strove to train
To do the bidding of their bestial brain—
Held in its little span the power that brings
The seen from unseen, turning thoughts to things?
Who would have dreamed the body's untried tool
A million million instruments should rule—
Loose with a turn the dreadful might of speed,
And bring to rest a giant so lightly freed?
What hunting man, who in his cavern drew
With childish joy the lines of beasts he knew,
Looking upon his squatting mate, could tell
That man should make all womanhood to dwell—
Beauty of soul and unimagined grace—
In lines and colours of a pictured face?
When Music, that angelic Bird, was caught,
Trapped by old wandering men, could She have thought,
As clumsy fingers touched the first rude lyre,
That hands could learn to speak the heart's desire?
The Egyptian who first scratched his marks on clay
Dreamed not that he was marking out the way
By which Keats' hand could glean his teeming brain,
Or Newton's make the mysteries of Nature plain.
What marvels have been wrought by hands of men,
With aid of wheel and lyre, and brush and pen!
But no less strange the power by which the hand
Speaks soul to soul, and makes us understand
All that the tongue can never turn to speech—
The longings for a love beyond our reach;
Or joy in love fulfilled, and mutual pride;
And all the steady faith of friendship tried,
Built on the rock of manhood's reticence;
Sweet candour of a child's swift confidence—
The clasp of fingers is the subtle token
By which these secrets of the soul are spoken.
Who knows what further power the hand doth hold?
What loftier purpose yet it may unfold?
We know its power to make; to translate feeling;
But scarce imagine yet its gift of healing.
In fugitive tales that future truth is stored
Which once upon a heedless world was poured:
Those Hands commanding, pleading, tortured, nailed,
As men count failure, in Their purpose failed:
Though by Their Touch the blind and lame were healed,
The fullness of that Power was not revealed:
Yet still the pledge remains: It hath sufficed
That men have felt upon their hearts the Hands of Christ.

MARJORIE NOEL HOW.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only development in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

PRACTICE AND THEORY, AND THE MINISTER

MATHEMATICS is in its nature pure theory, and it is appropriate that the mathematician should go on reading and thinking and writing and speaking about it. But religion is not entirely an abstract science; it cannot exist unless it is applied. One can go only a certain way with the theory of it, and then the theory itself becomes radically false unless it is put into practice.

The normal ways of practising religion and making something more than a name of holiness are through *work* and *play* and the *home*. But in this sense the minister has no work. He must exercise his legs and his brain, of course, but he has no clearly defined function to perform, of which he is the servant as other people are the servants of that which justifies their place in society. He cannot forget himself in his work; on the contrary, all he does makes him more conscious of himself. If he were to do what men expect of him, in the attitude of one performing allotted tasks, he would fail altogether to achieve his object. Men would say he had lost the "human touch". He must be free to act as the circumstances of the moment prescribe; there must be nothing prescribed beforehand.

When a man who is under authority is told, " Do this," he does not need to reason with himself about the wisdom of doing it; he does what he is told, and loses himself in the doing of it. He tries to do it better than he ever did it before. This gives his self-conscious mind—his conscience—a rest, and promotes moral health. The minister, on the other hand, exclaims with Wordsworth,

> Me this unchartered freedom tires:
> I feel the weight of chance desires.

A second differentiation is *play*. The minister has either no play or very little, for the simple reason that he has nobody to play with. Other people form tennis clubs and all kinds of social clubs, and the members have this in common, that they are all drawn from the same

social class and have the same outlook on life. There are some clubs where ministers may meet, but this is exceptional. And if the minister might overcome the difficulty inherent in outlook, yet this obstacle remains and prevents him from forgetting himself in play—namely, the fact that his leisure time is the time when other people are most engaged in work, and their leisure time is in the evenings, when he is most a minister. He does not even observe the "day of rest".

Finally, he is differentiated from other people by the home. Very many ministers are not married, and have no home. For the rest, the minister's house is an appendage of the church, and all that happens in it has a peculiar significance for other people than its inmates. "The fierce light that beats upon the throne" is dim in comparison with the light that beats upon a minister's so-called "private" life. He has no private life in the sense in which other people have it. He cannot say, " Here at least I may forget the spectators and be myself."

We conclude that he can never be normal, because he is deprived of work, play, and home. Nobody can realize himself unless he forgets himself, and this the minister is not allowed to do. Nobody is quite alive unless he sometimes gives up working out theories of conduct and allows his theories to work themselves out. This is the relation of Practice to Theory, and this relation is broken in the life of a minister.

Two consequences follow, which are often observed but seldom attributed to their proper cause. First, there is that which is deplored by one of the people who conduct the symposium called *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table,* namely, the frequent dullness of preaching. How should preachers ever be dull, with such a message to proclaim? The answer is that the sublimest truths become dull when they are regarded with a purely abstract interest. One can imagine, for example, that considerable animation might attend the discussion of a question of town-planning. But as soon as the question becomes an abstract one it is not easy to be animated any longer. No heart was ever uplifted, no eyes shed tears, over the propounding of the truth that two sides of a triangle are greater than the third side.

Secondly, here is an explanation of the tendency of ministers to become formal and ritualistic, and to promote the institutional part of religion. They hanker after forms because their lives lack forms. Other people, who are weary of the excessive routine of their lives, long for something purely spontaneous or "spiritual" in their religious exercises. But the minister, weary of the abstract spirituality that fills his life, longs for definite prescribed forms. He desires also to make the Church a definite institution, with the laws and duly-allotted functions of an institution, so that he may conceive himself

as having a vocation in the world—something outside himself, precise and concrete, to which to relate himself. Therefore he may even become a Roman Catholic priest, although he has been accustomed to advise all other men to keep away from the dishonesty and tyranny that the Roman Catholic Church embodies. The true cause why Protestant clergymen become priests is not, as we are so often told, that they "must have something to believe", but that they must have something to *do*.

There is another side to this whole question of the relation of Practice and Theory. The impatience of the modern world with all religious observances is not to be laid at the door of the representatives of the Church alone. *They* are too much pre-occupied with theory. Most people, on the other hand, are too much pre-occupied with practice. One recalls G. K. Chesterton's deprecating of the usual description of the "practical sweep". What we need, he says, is more theoretical sweeps, and more theoretical people of every sort. Without doubt he is right. One might amplify the theme with special regard to the class of people in society who regard themselves as the mainstay of the Church, the respectable middle class. They do not want to be disturbed with any theory of life which conflicts with the theory that their inherited standards are final, for on this they base their practice. That theory has actually broken down, but the whole order of society may come tumbling about their ears before they will acknowledge any defect.

But our present purpose is to consider one side of the matter only —the minister's side. It remains to make some suggestions about the overcoming of the separation of Practice and Theory which is a fact of his experience.

The Jews had a rule—to which they may still adhere—that their Rabbis, their religious teachers, should support themselves by working at a trade. In line with this, the Apostle Paul was a weaver or a tanner. It was a good rule, and a return to it by modern clergymen would be an unqualified blessing.

The religious brotherhoods of history also have something to teach us. It cannot be good to have a minister set in isolation over a congregation, having little association with any other minister. In every city and town at least there could be a college of teachers and pastors, either living together, or with a good deal of association. So they would know something of normal human relations, in which the theory they discuss might be put into practice.

But the heart of the question is in the conception we have of the function of the Church and of the Ministry in the Church. For there are two alternatives, generally confused, but really sharply opposed. These are the conception of the Church as Priest and the conception of the Church as Prophet. People have been conscious of the sharp opposition between these conceptions in generations tha

are past, and a great deal of Church History relates to the opposition. It cannot be maintained that to-day the opposition has been overcome. It has been confused and has become unconscious in our minds, and that is the only difference.

For the fulfilling of the priestly function it is necessary that the Church should be a highly organized system and that responsibilities within it should be clearly defined. The responsibility attaching to the minister may then be that of teacher. If so, the same respect is due to his authority as to the authority of any other teacher. He is not to be accorded merely whatever respect his personality may command, but he has a right to a certain place in men's esteem by virtue of his office, for which he is assumed to have qualified. In performing the duties of that office he puts his theory into practice. He becomes like other people in having a specific function as a teacher of his subject. Or he may be regarded as an administrator and ruler. Then people do what he tells them, not because they like him, nor because they think he is right, nor because he has an overbearing manner, but simply because he holds a certain office, comparable with the office of a civil magistrate, and is invested with similar authority and similar responsibility. In filling that perfectly definite office the minister follows his vocation; he is conscious of definite demands made upon him; his theory of life is real because he embodies it in practice.

This priestly function of the minister depends on the priestly function of the Church. But if one cannot conceive the Church to have any authority over its members, if one considers that the only forms of human association that ought to be recognized are political and economic, then it must follow that one cannot conceive the minister to have a priestly vocation.

What then remains? The alternative that remains is a conception of both Church and Ministry as prophetic in their function. This is stated in the elementary truth that God "by divers portions and in divers manners" from time to time entrusts some men with a message to their fellows. Never a great wrong is perpetrated but somebody rises up to denounce it. Every generation has its prophets. They are poets, statesmen, novelists, playwrights—men of every class and calling, who have keener spiritual sensibility than other people, men of vision who tell what they have seen. Sometimes it may happen that they are preachers in the Church. But not all preachers exercise the prophetic function—though many think they do who only deliver at second hand what the veritable prophet has written or said. For if it is to have a place in the Church it cannot be through any recognized office. Inspiration cannot be reduced to a system. A government cannot run its own revolutions.

The reluctant conclusion is that if the priestly function is to be ruled out it is not necessary to maintain any Church order at all.

What the exercise of the prophetic function does demand is that the
should be liberty of opinion and of speech. In every pla
individuals would then be found forming groups of disciples arou
them; people would turn aside from their work to discuss the meani
of their work in the light of eternity, and would be led
their thinking and in their worship by such men as proved themselv
to have natural insight and eloquence. In this scheme there is
room for any of the professional ministries at present exemplifyi
every possible degree of compromise and confusion of thought, a
stultifying themselves by their inevitable separation of Practice a
Theory.

Underlying all questions of reunion is this distinction, whi
cannot be ignored but must be made clear if there is to be any reali
in the proposals. The prophetic community must no longer en
the name of Church, and the prophet must no longer desire the offi
while repudiating the name, of priest. A definition of functio
alone will make it possible to reconcile once more Practice wi
Theory.

W. S. Ferrie.

A FELLOWSHIP OF PRAYER.

It began—if it is possible to trace the beginning of these things at
—on a Wednesday night. There were fewer than ever at the wee
night service. I should be ashamed to tell how few there were. A
yet perhaps I ought to tell, because is it not God's way to make b
things out of small ones, and bring strength out of weakness? T
be exact, then, there were eight of us, and a pretty depressi
business it was. I put aside the notes of my address. I just offe
an opening prayer and then asked if anyone could tell me the reas
for such a small meeting.

Then followed a discussion in which I was more a listener tha
speaker. I heard the spiritual condition of the church being discuss
in a way I had never heard before. It was not conducted in any spi
of righteous condemnation of those who were absent. On the co
trary, it was all remarkable for its humility. They spoke about "w
all the time, and every criticism of the church went right home
"us". Of course, the burden of it all was the appalling poverty
our prayer-life. Before I realized it an hour had slipped by, so
sung a hymn, asked God's blessing, and then went home. We h
come to no conclusions. We had made no decisions. Altogethe
felt a little confused about what had taken place.

Three or four weeks went by and then came one of those aw
Sundays which are enough to break a minister's heart. It w
evening and the rain was pelting down. As I sat in my study p
paring for the service I was certain there would be "no one there

When I opened the vestry door into the church and went into the pulpit I saw that my fears had been justified. The congregation was quite the smallest I have ever seen—fifty people in a building which holds a thousand, and of course scattered all over the place, including the gallery. It was impossible to preach a sermon. So when the time came I laid aside the sermon, left the pulpit, and came down to the very front of the church. I told the people of our recent week-night service experience. I retailed much of what had been said, and then I found myself giving a pledge to face up to the situation and evolve something that would nourish the spiritual life of the church more effectively. Once again I went home with not the slightest idea of what to do, and also with the encouragement of one member who told me that he "didn't see why they should have been done out of a sermon—the few who were there being made to suffer for those who were absent".

Time went on and I felt I could do nothing more than let the thing germinate in my mind for a while. And then one day I asked myself if it were right to proceed on the assumption that my people were not praying. Perhaps there was prayer in many unexpected places, very timid and reluctant to make itself known. If that were so—and why should I not assume it?—ought not I as a minister to enlist that prayer for the life and work of the church? Was there no way in which I could get to know about it and, without intrusion, claim the privilege of directing it in some respects?

So I settled down to sketch out the different methods of prayer known to me which might be expected to have a place in the lives of some of my people. There were surely those who still kept to the morning and evening prayer. Indeed I knew there were, when I came to think of it. They would be certain to give their help. Then there were those whose prayer more frequently took the form of a thought, unformed and inarticulate, sent out on the wings of desire into the unseen. This, I felt sure, was a way of prayer that would be recognized by many, young and old.

Next I thought of those who would never be willing to make known what was their manner of praying. Would they consent, I wondered, at least to acknowledge that they did pray, and would they be willing to group themselves according to their most lively interest in the church, as workers? Then there was that company of people who by their circumstances were unable to join in the fellowship of worship—the sick, mothers with little children, and others who for good reasons are kept from church. And, again, there were those who would never willingly surrender the opportunities of meeting together for prayer, either in silence or as guided by inspiration.

So I drew up the outline of a Fellowship of Prayer which should include all these. The letter and the outline is printed below exactly as drawn up and sent to all members and worshippers. I had no

idea at all what response might come, but I was determined not to force it. I had decided that if twenty joined it would be worth while. It would mean that I should send them a pastoral letter at intervals calling them to pray for certain objects, and I should know with certainty then that the affairs of the church were being laid before God in many ways, at many times, and by a number of people. After I had sent out the invitation someone told me I ought to preach about it. I was a little reluctant to do this because I wanted the response to be spontaneous and quite unforced. However, I consented to speak about it one Sunday night.

Strangely enough that night was again one of those disastrous Sunday evenings which try a minister's patience. I had the merest handful of people. But I comforted myself with the thought that they were the ones who most wanted to come, so I went through with it.

And now the result. To my amazement I had over a hundred replies. I hardly knew what to do. This was so much more than I had expected. Moreover I began to think of the work involved in sending out a hundred letters every month. How could it be done? A friend offered me the use of his duplicator. Another friend offered to address envelopes. A third offered to deliver them. A fourth thought it was going to be rather expensive, so would I accept a gift? All these offers came unasked for, and they have been most gladly accepted.

Our Fellowship of Prayer is now in regular order, and I could quote incidents and experiences which are the undoubted outcome of the prayers that have been offered. It has given me the opportunity of writing pastoral letters of a kind that one would not readily print in a magazine. I feel that I have more than a hundred people in my confidence. I have only to mention a thing and it becomes a prayer. The results are incalculable. The streams of prayer that before were allowed to trickle their way across the life of the church are now directed into a deep and life-giving river which flows through every department of activity.

But that is not all. The stream has gone far out beyond this church. I have never sought publicity for the Fellowship, but it has been claimed. I have spoken about it, because I was asked, to the ministers of my Province, and I believe that many of them have adapted it to their needs. I have been called upon to speak about it to ministers of other denominations. And now I am asked to write about it in our *Quarterly*. It has already gone across the sea, for one of our members has gone to China, and before leaving joined the Fellowship of Workers.

I have proved to my own satisfaction that it was a cruel libel on my church ever to have supposed that prayer was failing. It had not failed. Rather, it lacked direction. The old prayer meeting is

not enough for to-day. It helps and satisfies very many. But there are many more for whom it means nothing. This does not mean that they do not pray. Nor does it mean that they are unwilling to join in the fellowship of prayer. But prayer to-day is very shy, and perhaps all the more real for that. At any rate I have discovered a new reality in the church which I had not recognized before, and I can give thanks now for that deplorable Wednesday evening which was the beginning—if it is possible to trace the beginning of these things at all.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF PRAYER.

" More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?"

I invite all my people to group themselves for prayer in one or more of these Fellowships, which together will give support to all sectional prayer-meetings, and extend beyond the circle which meets on Wednesday nights. The purpose of each is to secure that the great affairs of our Church shall constantly be carried upon the hearts of our people before God. We ought at all times to pray for one another and for the business of His Kingdom as it is being carried out by this Church.

At intervals I propose to send a letter to the members of each Fellowship, containing suggestions appropriate to the particular group. Members will also be furnished with a list of those who belong to their group.

In these five Fellowships there is sufficient diversity of method and outlook to draw together the greatest number into the one common purpose which Jesus Christ has named: " Men ought always to pray."

The Fellowship of the Secret Watch.

There are some for whom a morning or an evening prayer is the most effective devotional approach to God. In these few moments before the day begins, or at its close, our affairs are brought to God, our friends are remembered, our life is adjusted to the example of our Master and in quietness and confidence we find our strength. There are new prayers to be offered and new friends to be helped by such a fellowship as this.

The Fellowship of Silent Thought.

There are some whose way of prayer is to pause in thought for a moment in the very midst of the day's work, allowing some petition, thanksgiving, confession, or some other prayer-thought to hold the field of consciousness. Without striving, without words, but in spirit and in truth we wait upon God, and He who reads the heart can hear the prayer. This is sometimes the way in which young people are best able to learn the meaning and the value of prayer. There are certain prayer-thoughts waiting to be shared by such a fellowship.

The Fellowship of Workers.

There are some who work in spiritual isolation, knowing little of their brothers' needs. But a strange new power comes to all who know that

every day the work they do is being held in remembrance before God by their fellow-workers in other spheres. All who come under the name of Church Worker, and others who hold them in special sympathy, may join this Fellowship for the mutual support it will give, each commending the work of the other to God in whatever manner they are accustomed to pray.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF HOME WORSHIPPERS.

There are some who cannot join with us in public worship or in the active life of our Church. These are the sick, the disabled, the aged, the mothers of little children, and those who nurse or serve at home. And there are others who by their visits and their prayers are constantly carrying to such homes the spirit of love which is moving in our company. All these may band together to take their share in the Church's life.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE UPPER ROOM.

There are some who greatly love the meeting together for prayer, remembering those experiences of the Upper Room from which first sprang all the strength and vitality of the Christian Church. For such we may form a Fellowship to meet in the Church between 8 and 8.30 p.m. on the Saturday before the first Sunday of the month. During that time the Church shall become a place where members of the Fellowship may resort for prayer. They shall come and go as they please, and for a few minutes only the Minister will guide the thoughts and prayers, and a little time shall be set apart for those who are willing to pray aloud.

This Fellowship is especially recommended to business people, who might well turn in here on their way home. It will make a fitting conclusion to the month, and a helpful preparation for the next.

[Here followed an application form for those desiring to join any section of the Fellowship.]

N. A. TURNER-SMITH.

CHRIST'S WORK FOR THE CHILDREN.

A SUNDAY School opening new buildings and looking for some suitable ceremony with which to celebrate that opening may find this record of the opening of the Sunday Schools of Trinity Church St. Albans, of service.

After puzzling our heads and pooling our experience we decided to hold a three days' Exhibition which should illustrate "Christ's Work for the Children—in Our Own and Other Lands through all the Centuries and To-day." The Exhibition divided itself naturally into two main Sections: I. The Work done in our own land. II. The Work done in other lands.

Section I was organized by our "Social Service Committee." The exhibits were arranged on different stalls covering almost every aspect of child life—Health, Work, Play, Welfare, Sunday School, The Ill-used Child, The Poor Child, The Child Offender. It included all sorts of things, from an old "battledore spelling card" to furniture actually made in the exhibition by the boys of the Herts (Reformatory) Training School.

One of the very happy features of the Exhibition was the introduction to so many Societies and people who are working for the children in one way or another. Societies like the Shaftesbury Society, the Save the Children Fund, the N.S.P.C.C., the League of Nations Union, as well as the Sunday School Union, were most eager to co-operate by lending interesting exhibits and sending speakers.

Section II was organized by our "Foreign Missionary Committee." The L.M.S. Headquarters provided exhibits illustrating the difference Christ has made to child life in India, China, Africa and the Islands of the Seas. "Fifteen-minute Talks" were given by experts at one or other of the stalls. The range of subjects covered by these talks may be inferred by the titles of those given on the last day: "Education"; "Children of Central Africa"; "The Poor Child of 60 Years Ago and To-day"; "Child Welfare Work in St. Albans"; "Children of Central China"; "Scouts and Scouting"; "Pictures for the Children"; "Family Allowances"; "Village Education in India."

The general idea of the Exhibition was further illustrated and brought home by a series of tableaux given each evening. These were arranged and produced by the Sunday School. First there were tableaux illustrating well-known stories of children in the *O.T.*—Moses, Joseph, Samuel, David, and others. Then a series of lantern slides depicted the life of Jesus as a child, and His subsequent contact with children as recorded in the Gospels. Tableaux followed representing important developments in the work of Christ and His Church for children—from Lois instructing little Timothy, to the founding of the first Sunday School by Robert Raikes; and then a play showed what has been done and is being done for the children of the non-Christian world. Last of all came a tableau in which all who had taken part were massed together while they and the whole audience sang "Jesus shall reign."

We were considerably helped by "The Challenge Books and Pictures, Ltd.," of 24 Great Russell Street, who, in return for the privilege of selling their publications (and this was the only selling in the Exhibition except the refreshments looked after by the Women's Meeting) decorated our walls and stalls with most beautiful posters that would appeal to children.

The preparation for the Exhibition and the Exhibition itself constituted a most delightful experience and were of real value to those of us engaged in it, to the Church as a whole, and to those of the outside public who came in. Our Superintendent (Mr. S. Newell, 18 Church Crescent, St. Albans) will gladly send a programme of the Exhibition and any other information to anyone who writes to him enclosing a stamped envelope for reply. We did well, but our work is incomplete unless someone else begins where we left off and does very much better.

W. Morton Barwell.

CHILDREN AND THE OFFERTORY.

It is becoming increasingly difficult for the Christian Church to pa its way. The smaller congregations, the spasmodic attendance, ar the increased cost of upkeep through the decreased value of mone are placing large numbers of churches in a very difficult positio Besides, in this generation there is a smaller percentage of our peop who recognize and discharge their responsibilities. The childre grow up in the Church, and although within a few years of leavin school they are earning a good salary, they do not contribute to th Church with any sense of responsibility.

Some time ago a ministerial friend of mine told me of a youn lady in his congregation who, although earning over £4 a wee regularly placed a copper in the offertory even on special occasion She is not expected to support the home, for her father is in a goo financial position. He is, and always has been, a generous supporte of the church, generally making his gifts for the wife and family.

This practice is very general. The result is that the responsibilit of supporting the Church is never felt by the children. The matte of responsibility is a small thing so long as the child is still a chil but children grow up—and they are allowed to grow up—witho being brought face to face with the principle of self-sacrifice. S long as they remain at home, or so long as father lives, " Fath pays," and we allow the father to give for the family instead of trai ing members of the family to give for themselves.

The Freewill Offering Scheme is doing something to break dow this practice, but it is meeting with much opposition and makes b slow headway in our churches, especially when an effort is made include the children within its scope.

The usual practice in our homes is that when the child is goin to a service in which there is to be an offertory, the child goes to th parents for the " collection ". Of course the contribution is readi forthcoming, but the method is wrong.

Most of us have been astonished, within recent years, at th amount of money which children seem to have to spend, as compare with our own childhood. Parents seem to be more indulgent wi their children and they have more money to spend on them. Th child should be taught in the home to set aside a portion of this mone however small, so that his offering may be an offering in very dee It should become a matter of honour in the Sunday Schools that on such gifts be received. We do not want money from the parents *v* the child. We want gifts which come out of the child's life, ar offerings which are prompted by his own spirit of self-sacrifice.

We invite the children to our services that they may becon accustomed to the atmosphere of Christian worship, and we send the

to the Sunday School to learn the facts of the Christian Faith and Gospel. Why should we not aim at developing that central and distinctive thing—the spirit of self-sacrifice? The child should be taught early that the religion of Jesus costs something, and I have sufficient belief in human nature as God made it that the child will respond and grow up with this sacred charge making first claim upon its life and its resources.

If you wish to discover how much of the child is in the usual child's gift, make a test in your own school. Ask the children how many of them had money of their very own the previous week, and what became of it. Then ask the children where the money for the day's offertory came from. The questions will seem funny to the children; the answers will seem tragic to you.

Children are easily led to sacrifice. They become intensely interested in the things for which they have sacrificed, and great results can be secured by right direction in the early years.

Pocket money for older children should allow for church contributions. Children should be instructed in the art of conserving and dividing their allowance. Gifts for the church should be set aside first, not under compulsion but by choice and training.

Let it be clearly understood that we do not want more money from the children. We want a gift that is their very own, a part of themselves which is placed upon the altar and dedicated there. To miss a child when the offertory is taken is to snub the child. Let us admit the children to the sacred act of the offertory on the same terms as ourselves. It will become a part of their life.

The weakness of our church finance lies in the fact that it is not until late in life that we are made to realize the need of regular financial support of the Church. Our parents stood between us and the needs of the Church. We were allowed to spend our own money on ourselves until our own needs became established as the first consideration of our life.

People have so little to spare for the church to-day because they spend so much on themselves. The church is driven to all kinds of expedients in sheer desperation to exist. It is becoming increasingly difficult not only to maintain our own church, but our appeals for the larger Church outside our own fall upon deaf ears.

The Church stands for the spirit of self-sacrifice in life and the declaration of this fact and the practice of it is the only reason for our existence. We should state it without apology and without hypocrisy. Until we impress this principle upon the young lives committed to our charge, and provide them with opportunities to practise it, we shall continue to be embarrassed with financial difficulties and all our appeals for support will seem an impertinence.

W. H. Stubbs.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

PEPYS AND THE PREACHERS.

"And so to bed", would probably now be recognized by most Englis speaking people as a characteristic phrase from the diary of one, Samu Pepys, who recorded some things of so personal a nature that they see humorous to us in this more enlightened and more prudent age.

But the truth is that Samuel Pepys did much more than lie in his be Indeed, the phrase: "Up very betimes" is quite as characteristic of hi as the other, if less picturesque; and his "betimes" generally mea before 5 a.m. There is far more in the diary about periwigs and velv cloaks than about nightcaps. In the nine years during which we ha such an intimate record of his life their wearer was a high official of t "king's navee"—and extremely active in the performance of his dutie

The state of religion and the Church in his time was a tense and rapid changing one.

The diary opens at the beginning of the Restoration period, wi Charles II still at Breda, in Holland, but with the hopes of the Royalis fixed upon bringing him to these shores. The Episcopalians were elbowin out those ministers who had held sway in Cromwell's time, and Pepy who had been time-serving enough to make a show of Puritanism, is rath scathing when he has to mention the latter.

> 22nd (January), Lord's Day. To church in the afternoon to M Herring, where a lazy, poor sermon. This day I began to put on buck to my shoes.

A word of praise is given, too, whenever a preacher rails against t Puritans. At Whitehall Chapel in 1663,

> Dr. Creighton, the Scotsman, preached a most admirable, good a learned and most severe sermon, yet comicall, upon the words of t woman: "Blessed is the womb that bare Thee . . . . ." He railed bitter ever and anon, against John Calvin and his breed, the Presbyterians, a against the present terme now in use of "tender consciences." He ripp up the preaching of Hugh Peters, calling him "the execrable skellum

Rather easy, we think, to hit people who are down, and Hugh Pete had been hanged nearly three years before!

Pepys was one of the party that went to fetch King Charles II, b though he was wholly in favour of the new order of things, the moral a other delinquencies of that monarch soon caused him grave concern. the end of 1662 we find him lamenting:

> The King, in the meantime, is following his pleasure more than w good advice he would do, at least to be seen to all the world to do so. I dalliance with my Lady Castlemaine being publick every day to his gr reproach, and his favouring none at court so much as those who are confidants of his pleasure, which God put it into his heart to amend bef he makes himself too much contemned by his people for it.

Only two years before, he had set down:

> Fell a-reading of the tryalls of the late men that were hanged (for the king's death and found good satisfaction thereof.

In the course of the diary we see how the "Anabaptists" a "Fanatiques", whoever Pepys may include under those terms, were be kept from office in the navy, and how the Presbyterians were being ejec from the Church.

On the 17th August, 1662, we have Pepys as an eye-witness of

farewell of Dr. Bates at St. Dunstan's, and of Mr. Herring at St. Bride's, Fleet Street, with extracts from their sermons; but Pepys is fearful that "the bishops will not long be able to carry it so high".

Presently, on a certain "Lord's day":

> I saw several poor creatures carried by, by constables, for being at a conventicle. They go like lambs, without any resistance. I would to God they would either conform or be more wise and not be catched!

A characteristic note is found in 1664:

> 2nd of October, Lords Day . . . I intended to have seen the Quakers, who, they say, do meet every Lord's Day at the Mouth in Bishopsgate; but I could see none stirring nor was it fit to ask the way to the place; so I walked over Moorfields and thence to Clerkenwell Church, and there, as I wished, sat next pew to the fair Butler, who indeed, is a most perfect beauty still, and I do very much admire myself for my choice of her for a beauty, having the best lower part of her face that ever I saw all the days of my life.

As in our day, going to Church was sometimes for other things than the worship of God. This also has a modern ring:

> After Church to walk in the Mall, to observe the fashions, my wife desiring to make some clothes.

Sometimes, it is to be feared, Church did little good to him.

> Dec. 2nd, 1660. To Church, and Mr. Mills made a good sermon, so home to dinner. My wife and I alone to a leg of mutton; the sawce of which being made sweet, I was angry at it and eat none, but only dined upon the marrow bone that we had beside.
>
> 25th, Xmas Day. In the morning to Church where Mr. Mills made a good sermon. Home to dinner to a good shoulder of mutton and a chicken. After dinner to Church again where we had a dull sermon of a stranger that made me sleep.

But was it the sermon?

There is probably no book in our, or any, language with so wide a use of adjectives as applied to sermons. A few samples may be given, but there are many more.

> Mr. Mossum made a good sermon but only too eloquent for a pulpit. The Bishop of Chichester preached before the King and made a great flattering sermon.
>
> . . . . listened to a cold sermon of the Bishop of Salisbury's.
>
> Dr. Spurstow preached a poor dry sermon.
>
> Dr. Crofts made an indifferent sermon.
>
> Heard Mr. Thos. Fuller preach at the Savoy upon our forgiving other mens trespasses, shewing among other things, that we are to go to law never to revenge but only to repayre; which I think a good distinction.
>
> A most tedious, unreasonable and impertinent sermon by an Irish doctor. His text was: "Scatter them, O Lord, that delight in warre." Sir W. Batten and I very much angry with the parson.
>
> A stranger preached a good, honest and painfull sermon.
>
> At church, where a stranger preached like a fool.
>
> Mr. Jacomb, of Ludgate, made a gracy sermon, like a Presbyterian. At St. Paul's: A good sermon of Dr. Bucke's, one that I never heard before.
>
> To church, where a sleepy Presbyter preached.
>
> To church, and heard a simple fellow upon the praise of church musique and exclaiming against men's wearing their hats in church.
>
> To Church again and slept part of the sermon.
>
> To Church, where a most insipid young coxcomb preached.
>
> A most excellent and eloquent sermon, but in the evening our navy chaplain preached a sad sermon, full of nonsense and false Latin.
>
> To Westminster, and into St. Margarets, where I heard a young man play the fool upon the doctrine of purgatory.

> With my wife to Church, where we have not been these nine or ten weeks. A young simple fellow did preach; slept soundly all the sermon.
>
> Mr. Fuller, at Barking Church, preached well and neatly. To bed without prayers, it being cold and to-morrow washing day.

The use of Sunday, as revealed by the diary, provides an interesting study. Pepys himself, as well as attending church, usually made up his personal accounts; and we see his savings growing steadily, chiefly by his acceptance of bribes from captains and contractors in connexion with the navy. We see tailors delivering garments, a great deal of work done at the office, and a great deal of drinking and merrymaking at home. Apprentices riot in the streets, duels are fought in the fields and pleasure boats of all kinds are on the Thames, while on one occasion at least the whole household is called at 4 a.m. "to get the washing done".

The great plague is heralded by the entry of 3rd July, 1665:

> The season growing so sickly that it is much to be feared how a man can escape having a share with others in it; for which the Lord God bless me! or make me fitted to receive it.

He goes to reside at Greenwich but comes to London daily for his work at the Admiralty, even on fast days being there "at great advantage", he says, "because all is quiet". Strange that a man who is superstitious enough to carry a hare's foot as a safeguard against the colic, and brings God's name into most of his reflections, should take such little account of solemn fasts declared for the staying of the plague.

Enough has been said, however, to shew that the religion of Samuel Pepys was a strange mixture of self-congratulation, sermon-tasting, and superstition, though not without a touch of real godliness that found expression in family worship and in a deep appreciation of the best thought of his time.

The preacher who is most prominent in his pages is "Mr. Mills". Dr. Daniel Mills, to give him his due, who was for thirty-two years rector of St. Olave's, Hart Street. He is at first described by Pepys as "a very good minister", but comes in for some severe criticism later on. Most of his sermons, however, are described as "good", though occasionally there is another note.

> Apr. 29th, 1666, To Church, where Mr. Mills a lazy sermon on the Devil's having no right to anything in this world.

We may wonder whether to praise or blame him for the shrewdness shewn in the following:

> 18th Oct., 1663. The parson, Mr. Mills, I perceive, did not know whether to pray for the Queen or no, and so said nothing about her; which makes me think she is dead.

Pepys, too, is shrewd, for three days later we find:

> This morning, hearing that the Queen grows worse again, I sent to stop the making of my velvet cloak till I see whether she lives or dies.

The diary comes to an untimely end with 31st May, 1669, on a note of sadness; as, with his eyesight gradually failing him, he is driven to resolve to have kept for him a journal wherein only those things shall be entered that are "fit for all the world to know".

> And so I betake myself to that course which is almost as much as to see myself go into the grave; for which and all the discomforts that will accompany my being blind, the good God prepare me.

The worst, however, did not happen, and for thirty-four years after this he lived a full life. But the diary, having been once broken, was not, so far as is known, resumed again.

D. J. SHEPPARD.

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

Evangelische Jugendwohlfahrt. von Leopold Cordier. Schwerin in Mecklenburg: Friedrich Bahn. R.M. 20 and R.M. 24.

"The new spirit in education," says Dr. A. W. Harrison in an interesting article in the *Hibbert Journal* recently, "may be defined as the temper which is in revolt against the drill sergeant in the schools, which aims at the development of the individual along his own lines rather than at simultaneous class movements." The article in question is actually a review of M. Adolphe Ferrière's *Trois Pionniers de l'Education Nouvelle.* The first of the three pioneers is Hermann Lietz of Ilsenburg, a new Pestalozzi, who lived with his children after the manner of the master. "It was a little fellowship of joy and activity, but no orders were given. '*Hier giebt es keinen Befehl,*' and Lietz, '*alles muss Sitte werden.*' There were no punishments, children worked in school and in the fields, laughed and talked and played with the masters. Lietz, living and dressing like a peasant, was a true father to his growing family. The charm of the life came from the harmony of varied activities. Classes were short and interesting, broken up by intervals for making beds, games, work in the garden, or at the carpenter's bench. Music played a great part in the life of the school. There was chorus-singing for all, and the orchestra for the select musicians. Plays were given in the evenings out in the fields by the river. Religion had its influence in every part of the life, and the old Lutheran chants were sung, but there was no narrow and conventional representation of Christianity."

What was the result from the point of view of the cool outside critic who has to compare, with sympathy, but without bias, the results of such experiments with those of more conventional and traditional methods? "Generally speaking," said Lietz, "examiners have noticed that our scholars have a more solid general culture than those of the State schools, and show better judgment in scientific discussions. This is no doubt due to the fact that, while we may cram our scholars with fewer facts, we develop in them the power of sane judgment the better on that account."

It is impossible not to be struck by the likeness of these words of Lietz to the following significant passage from the conclusion to Prof. John Dewey's famous book, *Schools of To-morrow.* Speaking of the changes in the modern world which so imperatively call for corresponding changes in teaching method and matter he says: " . . . possibly most significant from the point of view of education is the incredible increase in the number of facts that must be part of the mental furniture of any one who meets even the ordinary situations of life successfully. But the schools, instead of facing this frankly and then changing their curriculum so that they could teach pupils how to learn from the world itself, have gone on bravely teaching as many facts as possible. But the change that is demanded by science is a more radical one. This includes not alone teaching of the scientific laws that have brought about the changes in society since their discovery, but (also) the substitution of real work, which itself teaches the facts of life, for the study and memorization of facts after they have been classified in books."

No doubt it is true that Dewey is thinking rather along American realist lines than, in the German way, of the more transcendental ideal of character-forming for its own sake. But is there any actual clash here in the end of the day? The farther I go, the less am I able to see or believe that science and religion (in the true and reverent sense of both words) contradict each other. It is only the travesty of science which finds an enemy in the travesty of religion. So the scientific educationist at his best in Dewey seems to present his ideal in almost the same words as the religious educationist at his best in Lietz. For the fearless search for truth is as much a characteristic of the great religious adventurers as reverence is of the great scientific teachers. And therefore we may and should expect that the atmosphere of reverence will also be that of research, of complete awareness and awakeness to the actual facts of the world in which we live. A well-known biologist has remarked that scientists no more like to be waked out of their dogmatic sleep than do theologians. But *such* scientists and *such* theologians are alike to be rejected; let us treat both classes as Virgil and Dante treated the dwellers in the vestibule of the Inferno :—

> Fama di loro il mondo esser non lassa;
> Misericordia e Giustizia gli sdegna:
> Non ragionam di lor, ma guarda e passa.

The person who is truly religious, whose life is purged from pettiness and self-seeking, whose source of serenity and of action is rooted in the eternal; he is the truly efficient, whose mind is clarified from fixed ideas, who is ever ready to adjust himself to fresh circumstances with high courage and unclouded intelligence. Lietz adopted as his motto the epitaph of Fichte, *Licht, Liebe, Leben.* And we know that Fichte and Schelling loved especially Plato and the Fourth Gospel, that gospel which rings the changes on these three aspects of the eternal spirit, light, love, life, which we find too in the Mandæan mysticism so closely allied with John's teaching. So that, after all, the new education is still inspired by the essential motives of that transcendental and yet immanent idealism which blossomed so splendidly again and again in the greatest epochs of European thought and life.

The great educators of the sixteenth century were not otherwise minded, however their contemporaries may have imitated the harsh methods of Orbilius, whose ferrule Horace so feared and hated. After all, the classical tradition had Quintilian as its guide. The Orbilii of life, happily seldom think out their own *rationale,* and still seldomer perpetuate their methods in treatises. The Orbilian method is to be sought rather in the *Soldier's Pocket Book* and its results in that horrible revelation, *A Private in the Guards.* Quintilian's memorial to his dead boy sprang from the fountain of tears, source at once gentle and strong. Beloved Roger Ascham was essentially of the classical school, and he could write a few years before 1571 :

> I will now declare at large, why, in mine opinion, loue is fitter than feare, ientlenes better than beating, to bring vp a childe rightlie in learninge.
>
> If your scholer do misse sometimes . . . chide not hastilie: for thai shall both dull his witte, and discorage his diligence: but monish him gentelie: which shall make him both willing to amende, and glad to go forward in loue and hope of learning.

And his opinion, again, is most clearly and plainly in accord with that of Lietz and of Dewey, as Mayor rightly points out in the introduction to his edition of *The Schoolmaster* :

> Ascham, however, had rightly a very moderate estimation of that sort of learning which can be taught by voice or book, and passively received into the memory. With as little of pugnacity or indocility as ever belonged to a lively and enquiring mind, he held fast the truth, that it is only by its own free agency that the intellect can either be enriched or invigorated; his favourite maxim was *docendo disces*. The necessity of being intelligible to others brings with it an obligation to understand ourselves.

By its own free agency. These words will at once rouse the suspicion of some and the antagonism of others, who will reflect that after all we do need to make sure that we are not giving in to a method which will prove centrifugal, will develop the individual in such a way as to produce rebels and eccentrics. To such it may be pointed out that it is far easier to produce a conventional type than it is to stimulate originality. "Men," as Stanley Ortheris remarked, "are sheep, bloomin' sheep," whilst changing life calls aloud for the adaptable and adapting and often makes holocausts of the conventional. The man who is really valuable to the community is the one whose own powers have ripened slowly and steadily. And the sixteenth century knew this too. In a book better known to the expert educationist than to the layman, but by him rated far above Ascham's masterpiece, Richard Mulcaster wrote, in 1581, in his *Positions*:

> I am specially to further two degrees in learning, first the Elementarie . . . then the Grammarian . . . the Elementarie: Bycause sufficiency in the child, before he passe thence helpes the hole course of the after studie, and insufficiencie skipping from thence to soone, makes a very weake sequele. For . . . sufficient time there, without to much hast, to post from thence to timely, draweth on the residew of the schoole degrees, in their best beseeming time, *and in the end sendeth abroad sufficient men for the service of their countrie*. And is not this pointe then to be well proyned, where hast is such a foe, and ripeness such a freind?

Apart from the charm of 16th century diction, is there not here a valuable protest against that hot-house forcing of information and facts of which there is to-day so much? How often is it proved true that insufficiency, skipping from thence too soon, makes a very weak sequel?

But it may be asked how far we are justifying our title. We have said much of education, little or nothing of what is usually understood by the term religious education. Perhaps, however, the ordinary signification of the term is not its best meaning. Not the instilling of a knowledge of certain stories, certain theological notions, but the total process of *leading out* and developing the child's mind *in a religious atmosphere* is alone worthy to be described as religious education. Just a little later than Mulcaster's time George Herbert wrote that

> A servant with this clause, Makes drudgery divine;
> Who sweeps a room, as for Thy laws, Makes it and th' action fine.

Such is the spirit animating all three of M. Ferrière's pioneers, the second of whom is the Sicilian Signore Lombardo-Radice, for five years (1907-1912) editor of the educational review which he founded, *Nuovi Doveri*, and now Director of Public Education in Italy under Signore Gentile. The principles which he taught abroad he practised in his own home, and if the good results were attributed to the special advantages his own children enjoyed, he would say, "I believe in the creative capacity of every child. Every child is a poet, an artist, a sculptor, a singer, a botanist, a theologian, a philosopher—what you will, after the fashion of a child. It is we grown-up people who block the avenues of the spirit." How true that is, that we all tend to get sclerosis of the mind so very soon. The third pioneer, Frantisek Bakule, of the famous school for crippled children at Prague, was nearly overborne by this mental sclerosis on the part of well-

meaning educational authorities. A curriculum was demanded from Bakule by the Board of Education of the then (1913) government. He supplied one, but never attempted to work to it. The story of how his apparently hopeless and helpless children were given hope and life and interest and ability is a fascinating one.

> I thought no more about the school and its curriculum, but I kept seeking, seeking without rest, the ways along which the members of my community might escape from the flames and the darkness of the hell of their mind and be led to their proper place in society.
>
> Could they make baskets, or cupboards, or rebind books? Yes, if they were taught. So the teacher had to set himself to learn these new employments, and he could never allow himself to dawdle in his own lessons, for the whole crowd would want to know what progress the master had made during the day. The schoolroom was then turned into a workshop.

Thus in Germany, in Italy, in Bohemia, the same spirit is breaking out again, and best of all, it is lovingly recorded by a Frenchman. Germany and Italy and the former Austrian countries were of course the great cultural area of the later Middle Ages, and felt themselves to have a unity of civilization as the Holy Roman Empire. The way in which they are still producing fresh ideas and experiments, or fresh forms of sound old ideas, in spite of the apparent barrier of the differing linguistic districts, is very significant and charged with hope for the future. The same criticism of course applies, as is applied to Froebel by John Adams in his *Herbartian Psychology* :—

> Not philosophy, but common sense, experience, and loving observation have led Froebel and his followers to adopt certain methods which are excellent in themselves, and which in capable hands produce admirable results. For this he deserves all the honour which has been heaped upon him—*but he has not explained John.* As a psychology it [Froebelianism] is simply non-existent. It suggests the immense importance of knowing John; which is much. It leaves to others the task of supplying this knowledge.

And further on in the same book the author attempts to supply this lack. In an interesting passage, for example, he shows how we should apply the principle of "universes of discourse," as the logicians say, to the endeavour to understand what is going on in the child's mind. Thus,

> At church, at Sunday-school, in the country during vacation, John enters a new world, where new ideas find a place and old ideas find a new place and a new meaning. The same idea varies with the world in which it finds itself. In school the idea of *pigeon* has to hobnob with disagreeable ideas of object lessons and the number of vertebrae in birds. In Sunday-school it takes up with Noah's Ark; at home it may deal with the delights of the backyard dove-cote or the charms of a certain class of pie; in the country it may form the centre of a system of snares.

All this is true, and yet every experienced teacher knows that, as a matter of hard fact, those who are most acute at demonstrating the nature of the child's psychological processes are far from always being the best teachers in practice. The personal element is such an important factor, and intellectual ability and training, however valuable—and they *are* valuable—cannot avail where love and sympathy are lacking. No amount of pedagogical training will make a self-centred intellectual into a good teacher. There's a *je ne sais quoi* which must be there, part of the personality.

And, now that we have tried to show how we must be interested Europeans if we are to keep abreast of the most progressive and healthy ideas in this, the most important of all efforts, the education of the coming generation in an atmosphere of reverent intelligence, let us turn to Her

Cordier's immense mass of evidence, the book whose title we originally quoted. A mass of evidence is really the best description of this immense tome. The well-known German theological review, the *Theol. Litteraturzeitung*, rightly described it as a vastly industrious collection of data for a thesis on the subject of Protestant education in Germany during and since Luther's time. It is really impossible to separate religious education from secular education. The origins of modern European and American teaching traditions are to be found in the desire to bring up children as intelligent Christians, just as all the older universities—and this is true, too, of Harvard and Yale—were originally religious foundations. In his *History of Education* Adamson opens with the following passage :—

> Modern public education has a two-fold origin which dates back to the early days of Christianity. Its various institutions, schools, colleges, universities and the framework of administration are the creation of the Christian Church. The Church's desire to master the significance of the Scriptures, and to propagate their teaching, maintained the connexion between Christian education and the system of rhetorical instruction which flourished under the pagan Roman empire. As a consequence two conflicting elements existed in the curriculum which the Middle Ages bequeathed to posterity. The primary object of early medieval learning was a thorough understanding of the Bible. But any sufficient study of the Latin language involved an acquaintance with Latin literature.

Thus two elements which disliked and feared one another quite as much as cheap science and pedantic religion do to-day are inextricably intertwined in our European-American educational traditions. My own belief is that the old culture areas of Central Europe are far more likely to be fecund sources of sound new ideas about this matter than is the objective pioneer spirit of the descendants of European immigrants in North America. For pioneer spirits are usually of what the Americans call an *extrovert* type. To survive in such an environment they must necessarily be intelligent rather than reflective, men of action rather than thought. Hence the reproach of materialism so commonly, though often very unjustly, levelled at the mentality of the newer countries. It is only in old populations where tradition has full weight that the most fruitful ideas are likely to arise, apart of course from technical inventions, which demand the quick sagacity of the activist rather than brooding reflexion. Thus it is that Luther, a natural conservative in the very best sense, and yet in another sense far more modern than Calvin—for the release from superstition comes through Luther the psychological rather than Calvin the logical—is rightly quoted in a mass of material which also includes the maxims of Pestalozzi. The two greatest interests of Luther were, in fact, he economic and educational problems of society—the fights against poverty and ignorance. To him these were evangelical tasks in the most direct sense. And his methods were *in essence* far ahead of those of the Calvinists. Their organization was admirable; their psychology deplorable. For Calvin, the lawyer, remained essentially a scholastic. Lawyer and scholastic deal with men in the mass. To Luther, that great student of Augustine, the first European psychologist, was revealed the meaning of personality. And his plans for social betterment worked out eventually in the Elberfeld-Barmen poor relief measures, as his educational ideals did in Froebel and Pestalozzi.

> Yea, sayest thou, all such sayings [*Matt.* 18^{6f}] are said to parents; what has that to do with councillors and the government? Well said, in truth. Yea, but if the parents do it not? Who is to do it then? Is it to remain undone and the children to be ruined? Where will councillors and administration find an excuse for not having undertaken this duty? For there are manifold reasons why parents do not carry it out.

And after explaining these at some length, dilating on the poverty and ignorance of many parents, he continues:

> Therefore 'tis a proper duty of the council and administration to have the greatest care and zeal with regard to the young folk. For since the goods, honour, bodies and life of the whole city are committed to their faithful hands, they would not act with integrity before God and the world if they did not seek the prosperity and improvement of the city day and night with all their power. Now the prosperity of a city does not lie alone in the evidence of great treasure, strong walls, fine houses and plenty of arquebuses and armour, indeed where there is abundance of these things and emptyheaded fools over and above, there is so much the more dreadful and mighty shame to that city; but the best and most abundant prosperity, well-being and power of a city lie in its having many goodly, scholarly, reasonable, honourable, well-educated citizens, who are therefore well able to gather, retain and make right use of treasure and everything good.

Thus Luther, whose evangelical faith was to him part and parcel, nay the inspiring motive of his zeal for education. To the religious man education is essentially a religious duty. Religion cannot be taught, for it is not a set of facts. But it can be imparted. And what is more, if we are irreligious ourselves, however we may prate of the Bible or the Church, we shall educate our children in irreligion. Which sort of education they will absorb depends on our own characters. So, to finish with more Luther:

> For since a city ought to and must have people, and everywhere the greatest breach, lack, and complaint is, that there are no people, we must not wait for them to grow up (we can neither hew them from stone, nor carve them from wood): God will not work miracles, so long as man can manage his affairs with the gifts God has bestowed. Therefore we must buckle to, and spare no trouble and expense, to educate and form them.

J. P. Naish.

The Mind of the Savage. By Raoul Allier. Bell. 15s.

The French edition of this work, *Le Non-civilisé et Nous,* was reviewed in *The Congregational Quarterly* (VI. 374f). The present translation is accurate and reads well. The publishers have done wisely in making more accessible a book that no missionary or student of the primitive forms of religion can afford to neglect. It is the best reply so far to the French sociological school of Durkheim and Lévy-Bruhl.

A. C. Underwood.

Herr Ludwig Klages is well-known in Germany as a psychologist, and his book, *The Science of Character* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.), which has been well translated by Mr. W. H. Johnston, is one of his latest and most characteristic writings. It is a real contribution to what is now known as characterology, and traces the development of personality and the source of morality from the purely psychological and scientific standpoint.

M. Jean Piaget's *The Child's Conception of the World* (Kegan Paul 12s. 6d.) is one of the more recent volumes in the International Library of Psychology, Philosophy, and Scientific Method, and is a sequel to two previous volumes by the same author on the *Development of Language and Reasoning in Children.* M. Piaget is a real authority on the subject and his book will be invaluable both to parents and teachers and to all others who are concerned with the study of child life.

W. B. Selbie.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

" Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

" A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London, and the date* 1929 *unless otherwise stated.*)

Daniel O'Connell, The Irish Liberator. By DENIS GWYNN. Hutchinson. 18s.

Lord Lansdowne. By LORD NEWTON, P.C. Macmillan. 25s.

Elizabeth Barrett Browning: Letters to her Sister, 1846-1859. Murray. 21s.

The Life of George Meredith. By R. E. SENCOURT. Chapman & Hall. 16s.

The Garden of Fidelity: The Autobiography of Flora Annie Steel, 1847-1929. Macmillan. 12s. 6d.

Six Great Anglicans. By F. W. HEAD, B.D. S.C.M. 6s.

The Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas Clifford Allbutt, K.C.B.: A Memoir. By Sir HUMPHRY DAVY ROLLESTON, Bart., K.C.B. Macmillan. 15s.

Memories of My Life. By EDWARD WESTERMARCK. Allen & Unwin. 16s.

Livingstone. By R. J. CAMPBELL, D.D. Benn. 21s.

Captain Scott. By STEPHEN GWYNN. Bodley Head. 12s. 6d.

All the books before us deal with Victorians, although O'Connell reached his zenith before the Queen's accession, and Scott's sublime hours came after her death. A galaxy like this one must dazzle the arrogant youngsters of the Georgian era, if they have eyes to see at all. But already there are signs that condescension to the Victorian age is on the wane.

The centenary of Catholic Emancipation seems to have brought much work to Mr. Denis Gwynn. Recently we received his *A Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation;* we refer to his biography of Cardinal Wiseman in our present Editorial; and now before us is this intensely interesting and well written life of Daniel O'Connell, one of the most striking demagogues Ireland or any other country has ever known.

Mr. Gwynn's sympathy with the Liberator compels the reader's sympathy too, sometimes against his judgment, for we cannot but be often repelled by the coarseness of O'Connell's invective, his bombast, and his almost invariable use of "personalities". But with his rise to power, his conquest over many difficulties in his profession, and the courage with which he faced many enemies and with which he refused to sanction an appeal to force, we cannot but sympathize, nor can we help regretting the long years of anti-climax after the Emancipation, when new men with new views came to the fore and the Liberator's power gradually decayed.

There are misprints on pp. 24 and 228.

Lord Newton has been wise to compress his biography of Lord Lansdowne into one volume—a well illustrated book of some 500 pages. On the whole it is a competent piece of work, though we think the first half benefits by being free from the partisanship that marks the years

when Lord Newton himself began to play a part in political life—t references to Haldane, *e.g.*, are sometimes both superfluous and unworth

Lord Lansdowne was perhaps the last of the patricians, a *gra seigneur,* with old-time courtesy and immense dignity, and with a sen of duty and public service which sent him from the homes and the la he loved to be Governor-General of Canada and then Viceroy of Indi and finally brought him back to the War Office and the Foreign Office turn. As a statesman Lord Lansdowne must be put among the go second classes: if history lifts him to the first class it will be for t Lansdowne Letter of 1917, the publication of which showed him to posse both foresight and courage. He stands out as perhaps the best represe tative in our own time of the public-school, English-gentleman type, wi its virtues and its limitations: there were many things he would nev stoop to do, while it is typical and significant that, we believe we are rig in saying, there is not a single mention of religion and his attitude spiritual things in the biography.

Once more we cannot but be struck by the part played by the monar in public affairs. Queen Victoria's interference, especially in regard military matters, is constant, and her references to Gladstone as abominal as usual. In 1887 she writes to Lord Lansdowne, then Governor-Gene of Canada :—

> The Queen fears Lord Lansdowne must have had many troubles contend with, including those in his own Irish property. He will ha followed with interest and disgust the accounts of the debates on the Crim Bill and the language and conduct of the Irish, and not only of them, b of Mr. Gladstone and a few others. It is dreadful to see a man who w three times Prime Minister fall so low! But fortunately his influence h greatly diminished, and especially in this country there is a great change

And this is how the impartial constitutional monarch speaks of t elections of 1892 :—

> She feels more than ever at this painful, anxious moment when, by incomprehensible, reckless vote, the result of most unfair and abomina misrepresentations at the elections, one of the best and most useful Gove ments have [*sic*] been defeated—how important it is to have so able a reliable a Viceroy in India.
>
> The Queen-Empress can hardly trust herself to say what she feels a thinks on the subject. Apart from the pain of parting from some gr personal friends and people whom she can trust and rely on, the dan to the country, to Europe, to her vast Empire, which is involved in having these great interests entrusted to the shaking hand of an old, wild, a incomprehensible man of 82½, is very great! It is a terrible trial, but, tha God, the country is sound, and it cannot last. The Gladstonian majority quite divided, and solely depends on the Irish vote.

There is, however, a most interesting letter from Lord Balfour wh makes clear that Edward VII had little to do with foreign politics, a did not deserve the reputation he had of being both an astute a a successful diplomat.

Anything relating to the Brownings is welcome, but we must conf that these new letters are a sugary dose. In the love letters Robe robustness and commonsense make the correspondence palatable; th letters to her sister Henrietta make us realize what "Ba" would have b like had Robert never come her way and set his true love free. In of her letters she admits that "Peni's fault"—she admits very few in paragon child—" presently will be some excess of sentimentalism", we cannot wonder after reading these letters.

In them we have much about clothes, about Peni, and Henrietta's children, and about the sister Arabel: a good deal too about spiritualism—on which subject the two poets had to agree to differ—and about Italian politics. Mrs. Browning does not shine as a politician: she believed in Louis Napoleon and thought the Crimean "a most righteous and necessary war". Altogether these ultra-feminine letters afford the least pleasing picture of Mrs. Browning we have yet seen. She is always wanting to manage the affairs of her sisters, and to bring up Henrietta's children for her, and there is something the least bit "catty" about her comparison of her own child with his cousins. But the sight of the happiness which resulted from a marriage that could only be called extremely risky will gratify all Browning lovers, who will enjoy glimpses of many celebrities—Carlyle, Tennyson, and the Prince of Wales among them.

Dr. Leonard Huxley has performed the editor's task with modest efficiency, but we should like to venture two conjectural emendations—*her* for *here* on p. 21, and *hap* for *get* on p. 70.

Mr. J. B. Priestley's volume in the "English Men of Letters" series and Mrs. Sturge Gretton's study have been noticed in these pages, but Mr. R. E. Sencourt's claims to be the authoritative biography. It is a competent piece of work, and it is timely, for it is probably in the present generation that the fate of Meredith's writings will be determined—certainly it is but rarely that we meet readers of either the novels or the poems in these days, although it might have been expected that the poems would have a vogue.

Mr. Sencourt's weaknesses are a love of fine writing and an enthusiasm for his subject which results in extravagant claims, such as: "Here (*Richard Feverel*) the beauty is richer, and the tragedy more intimate, than in *Romeo and Juliet*" (p. 65); "The whole country recognized the passing of the greatest of her writers"; "a writer who, at his best, was not less than supreme".

On the whole, however, the book is sound in its narrative of the life, and suggestive in its criticism of the works. It fails to convince us that Meredith had not a good deal of the snob in him, but it does show us a red-blooded individual who was not afraid to live life to the full.

The world is poorer for the passing of Mrs. Steel, who died a few months ago. It is a matter for thankfulness, however, that she had practically finished her autobiography, one of the liveliest and raciest books of its kind we have met. Mrs. Steel retained into the eighties the vigour of mind and charm of character that moulded her life, and it appears in these pages, whether they are describing unusual experiences in India, or more commonplace life in this country. Her achievements as a novelist, a fighter for the rights of women, and for women's education, are well-known, but it is exceptionally interesting to read her own account of them, to learn of her motives, and hear the outspoken expression of her views. Her frankness got her into and out of many a scrape, but it won for her the affection and respect of many in both the lands in which she spent her life.

With such frankness as her main characteristic it is remarkable that Mrs. Steel contrived to write her autobiography without revealing her maiden name! The book is delightful reading and is packed with good stories. We must make room for one about an English quartermaster posted on one of the captured German ships in Scapa Flow. To him a German quartermaster said, as they leaned over the rail: "I sinks nos'ing of your ships." No reply. "And I sinks nos'ing of your sailors." Still

no reply. "And I sinks nos'ing of your officers, your Jellicoes, yo Beattys ——", spitting over the rail. The Englishman turned and sa "Now! Look ee 'ere, I don't care a tinker's dam wot you thinks abo our ships, our sailors, and our officers, but don't you go spittin' into o sea".

We find Canon Head's a most disappointing book. Its six studies Simeon, Keble, Hook, Robertson, Kingsley, and Barnett are lectures pastoral theology delivered in Cambridge. The book at one and the sa time attempts to do three things: (1) to give an account of the life a work of six men; (2) to offer practical suggestions for parish priests bas on these accounts; (3) to link the lives together and show the relation the English Church to national affairs during the nineteenth century. A one of these three lines might have made a useful book. As it is, we ha naïve comments upon political history, and extracts from sermons, a disquisitions on preaching and Sabbath observance, all rolled togeth And so very often the new Archbishop of Melbourne bestrides the hec and refuses to come down on one side or the other. There is a wor vagueness about it all which is too often found in Church dignitaries all denominations, witness, *e.g.*, the sentences about eternal punishm on p. 208, or the classification together of Gladstone, Disraeli, Shaftesbu and Kingsley as "social reformers".

"When we were very young" the name of Allbutt was commo spoken round about us with bated breath in which awe and admirati mingled: the reason maybe is to be found in the medical joke that " good Yorkshireman would rest quietly in his grave if, before his dea he had not been seen by Clifford Allbutt".

Born in Dewsbury Vicarage in 1836, Allbutt read science and th medicine at Cambridge. In 1861 he settled in Leeds and did not lea until 1889, by which time he had established a more than national repu tion. After three years as Commissioner in Lunacy, he was appoin Regius Professor of Physic in Cambridge, which Chair he held until death in 1925. Right to the end he possessed a mind alert and tolera an outlook broad and sympathetic. English medicine was ind fortunate to have as occupants of its two main teaching posts men l Allbutt and Osler, masters in their own craft and calling, but a respected for their gifts of scholarship and style, and still more for th character and service.

Sir Humphry Rolleston, Allbutt's successor at Cambridge, has giv us an excellent biography, though he is far from having Allbutt's liter skill. His method of dividing the life into years and treating it chro logically tends to jerkiness, while sometimes "he" refers back to a ment of Allbutt a page before. Nevertheless the book is very readable, an while doctors will find it especially useful—we hope laymen will not deterred from reading it by the abundance of medical terms, for Allbu the man, is greater than all his work. His advice to students characteristic and may well close this short notice:

> "Never waste—even five minutes; always have something on y desk that you can do between lectures, before hall, and while wai for a friend. Finish everything up as you go; leave no loose ends. *N rest,* except in sleep; change your occupations."

We warmly welcome the translation of Dr. Westermarck's *Memor* which appeared in Swedish last year. Born in Finland, dividing much his life between professorships in London and in his native land, visit Morocco twenty-one times and staying there in all seven yea Dr. Westermarck's life contains variety enough to make the narra

extremely readable and interesting. And then it must be remembered that to his pioneer work in sociology and anthropology Dr. Westermarck added an ardent patriotism—he set forth Finland's case at Geneva in the dispute with Sweden about the Aaland Islands. The description of research in Morocco will probably be found the most pleasing part of the book, though the reader will share the writer's delight in his English home at Box Hill.

Our main impression on reading the book is of the difficulty a stranger finds in understanding a life and thought alien to him. Dr. Westermarck's summary of English manners and conventions shows how little he understood a new *milieu,* and one cannot but feel the same about his references to Christianity. He was never inside it, and his comments on matters like the problem of evil show that he has never got beyond an elementary acquaintance with theological thought. Here Dr. Westermarck is but in the same position as many men of science: if they would give the same amount of thought to the study of religion at its best as they do to its manifestations among primitive peoples, their conclusions might be different. It is a strange science that dissects the acorn and is blind to the oak.

One has only to think of Professor Coupland's *Livingstone on the Zambesi* to see how far Dr. R. J. Campbell falls short as a biographer. His genius lies in other directions, and we cannot help wishing that the publishers had left him free for what he can do so well, and invited, say, Professor Coupland to undertake to write the life of Livingstone. Dr. Campbell has had the advantage of unpublished material in writing his biography, but we have to confess that we did not get the thrill from it that we have received from smaller *Lives.* We have the impression as we read that the biographer warmed to his work as he went along: at any rate we found the second half of the book much easier going than the first. We are glad to find that Dr. Campbell gives us Livingstone, warts and all; the explorer was no plaster saint, and it is well to see him as he really was.

We are glad that Mr. Waldman has not confined his "Golden Hind" series to mariners and adventurers of Elizabethan days, and we have greatly enjoyed Mr. Stephen Gwynn's life of Captain Scott. The biography lacks nothing in polish, and it is written with a throb and zest that harmonize well with its subject.

Of course, Mr. Gwynn cannot improve on Scott's own words, some of them so familiar and stirring that thousands, knowing them by heart, have been inspired to courageous endeavour and arduous enterprise: but the parts of the biography dealing with Scott's early years and his life in the navy will be fresh to many. Captain Scott was one of the finest type of Englishmen: strong and sturdy, absolutely conscientious, with an impelling conception of life as duty and service. With these qualities he combined a sensitiveness and a literary skill unusual in one of his training and profession.

His life remains a call and a challenge—and we are grateful to Mr. Gwynn for telling the story of it in so appropriate and telling a manner.

EDITOR.

God. By J. MIDDLETON MURRY. Cape. 10s. 6d.

Time and time and time again in reading this book we have been reminded of R. J. Campbell in the "New Theology" days. There is the same winsome appeal, the same wistful, earnest searching, the same attractiveness, about it all. Here, we say, is an absolutely sincere man who has passed through deep waters manfully fighting his way to firm ground. There is, too, the same petulance; the same perversity; the same

childish delight in saying things he knows will provoke ("Luther an Calvin were rudimentary"); the same apparent playing with crucial topic (as in the pages which introduce D. H. Lawrence); the same belief tha the teaching is something new and strange, sometimes stated with naïv arrogance ("the book claims to be a significant organic variation in th metabiological mode"; "the combination of mystical experience and congenital intellectualism such as mine happens to be rare"; "implicit i the system of this book, is a system as coherent as Orthodoxy and mor true".)

And just as, listening to Campbell preach, we used to feel that he wa arguing out before his people the problems that confront most theologica students while still in college, even so we feel in reading Mr. Murry.

That does not mean, of course, that Mr. Murry does not approach suc problems from the point of view of his peculiar experience and see the from an unusual slant. His book must be read in the light of the auto biography which forms its early pages, and of Katherine Mansfield' *Letters* and *Journal;* in the light, too, of his previous books, *To the Un known God* and *The Life of Jesus.* The autobiography wins the reader' sympathy : the other books show the stones already worked into the edific Mr. Murry is building. (He has by no means finished yet, though h seems to think so. To change the figure, the gap made by Mr. Chester ton may be wide enough to admit Mr. Murry even as it has admitted Mis Sheila Kaye-Smith.)

Mr. Murry says he has been "a God-seeker, and a God-finder, and God-denier", these being in ascending order. God "is nothing but means of perpetuating the variations which are called values", "a ca culus for accurate description. The calculus is no longer acceptable"– and for it Mr. Murry substitutes the simpler calculus, "organism" o "Life". The "creation of the Christian God" is one of the greates achievements of humanity, but it is a real danger that to-day men shoul believe in Him, for, of course, to Mr. Murry God is but a projection o "man's progress towards inward order" and "man was for ever passin beyond the God whom he had created".

How a mystical experience started Mr. Murry on his quest : how th similarity between such an experience and an anæsthetic condition helpe to develop his thought; how he finds "metabiological coherence in the lif of Jesus" (metabiology, by the way, is "biology into which what ar known as 'values' are organically incorporated") whose "creative new ness . . . was inevitably death to the biological individual, but it wa Life to the process as a whole"—all these we must leave readers to fin out for themselves in a remarkable book. We shall be surprised if sym pathy and antipathy do not frequently alternate as they read : bu throughout, whether they agree or challenge, they will be made to think And we shall be surprised if most of them do not wonder whether Mr Murry has any sense of humour. We hope he will not think us flippan when we say we wish his book had any sign that he could laugh at him self : we really think he should make a practice of seeing or readin *What Every Woman Knows* at least once every year. EDITOR.

The Testament of Beauty. A Poem in Four Books. By ROBERT BRIDGES Oxford Press. 7s. 6d.

It would be far easier to write a long article on the Poet Laureate' poem than to write a short review : one wants to discuss the format, th "simplified spelling", the poetry, and, perhaps most of all, Dr. Bridges' philosophy, quoting as one goes along. But that is as impossible as it i impossible to characterize these four books of free alexandrines in whic

Dr. Bridges sees the Spirit of Man, with Reason as Charioteer, driving the horses Selfhood and Breed, the Charioteer's relation to Beauty, Friendship, and Christ being revealed as the work proceeds.

The poem is strangely uneven. Sometimes Latin and Greek are invoked to help; sometimes we have lines like

> The ground-root folly of this pitous philanthropy
> is thinking to distribute indivisibles,
> and make equality in things incommensurable:

or

> . . . . like a hungry spider,
> blindly spinneth her geometric webs, testing
> and systematizing even her own disorders,
> her solipsism and her gossamer ontologies
> gnostic or cabbalist:

But then there are passages of real beauty, both of form and content. Of these we can quote two only:

> So it was when Jesus came in his gentleness
> with His divine compassion and great Gospel of Peace,
> men hail'd him WORD OF GOD, and in the title of Christ
> crown'd him with love beyond all earth-names of renown.
> For He, wandering unarm'd save by the Spirit's flame,
> in few years with few friends founded a world-empire
> wider than Alexander's and more enduring;
> since from his death it took its everlasting life.
> HIS kingdom is God's kingdom, and his holy temple
> not in Athens or Rome but in the heart of man.

> 'TWAS at thatt hour of beauty when the setting sun
> squandereth his cloudy bed with rosy hues, to flood
> his lov'd works as in turn he biddeth them good-night;
> and all the towers and temples and mansions of men
> face him in bright farewell, ere they creep from their pomp
> naked beneath the darkness;—while to mortal eyes
> 'tis given, ifso they close not of fatigue, nor strain
> at lamplit tasks—'tis given, as for a royal boon
> to beggarly outcasts in homeless vigil to watch
> where uncurtain'd behind the great windows of space
> Heav'n's jewel'd company circleth unapproachably.

Dr. Bridges's scholarship ranges over every land and time: he discusses Alexander the Great and the recent excavations at Ur, prayer and class-hatred, Freud and Aristotle, and finds his illustrations in many a field. He leaves us bewildered, instructed, and grateful, and determined to turn to his pages again and again.

EDITOR.

The Holy Spirit from Arminius to Wesley. By HOWARD WATKIN-JONES, M.A., D.D. Sharp. 12s.

All serious students of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit have been indebted to Dr. Watkin-Jones for his continuation of Swete's historical work, in the volume entitled *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, which appeared seven years ago. That book covered ten centuries, and this, which is only a few pages shorter, covers but two, the seventeenth and the eighteenth. This means that the treatment is much more detailed, and perhaps unnecessarily so; the amount of attention given to Wesley's theological position seems disproportionate. The review is indeed chiefly concerned with English theologians of the period, and students will still find it necessary to use Noesgen's *Geschichte der Lehre vom heiligen Geiste* for the corresponding movement in Germany. But no history of

thought can ever be complete, and we can be grateful for this study, whic puts before us in reliable summary or quotation the main points of discus sion by writers whom few will have the time and inclination to consul at first hand. The plan of the book is to give a " Historical Introduction' covering the two centuries, and then to treat the subject topically, *e.g.* " The Godhead of the Spirit" or "The Spirit and the Human Will." (I the last connexion it may be noted that the author would exonerate Wesle from the charge of " Arminianism," except in the sense that he was anti Calvinist.) The large amount of detail in the book makes it difficult, i not unprofitable, to read consecutively; but it will be indispensable to th student of the history of the doctrine. To the reconstructive side it make no contribution. H. Wheeler Robinson.

What do we Mean by God? By C. H. Valentine, M.A., Ph.D S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

In this book Dr. C. H. Valentine has continued the argument for th objectivity of Christian experience which was developed in his *Moder Psychology and the Validity of Christian Experience*. The keynote o the book is the word " response." God means ultimate reality as respon sive to human needs; man's response to responsive reality makes hi religion. Reality must be personal to make such a response to the person included in the system of reality. The nature of the response to huma personality is redemptive.

The method of the book is to " begin with existent reality and attemp to demonstrate its suitability as the basis for the idea of God." Th foundation of the argument is laid in Part I, whilst Part II deals with man' response to God, and Part III with God's response to man. The genera conclusions will be acceptable to Christian theists, but not much attentio is given to the difficulties of those who will not admit the religiou responsiveness of the system of reality. It is doubtful whether the respon siveness on which the author stakes his case is an adequate category o the divine; this is seen, *e.g.*, in the treatment of the Holy Trinity: we ar told that "Monotheism is the substantive, the Trinity is adjectival' (p. 208), yet that, within Himself, " God is a perfect system of persona response " (p. 190), which certainly requires more than the adjectiv " responsive."

The book shows philosophic insight and patient thought, but it i unpardonably dull for such a theme. There is wearisome repetition, ye no clear outline of the course of the argument, and no sub-division of th chapters. The style is heavy, and the book will, it is to be feared, prov uninteresting to the general reader, who might have been helped by it argument. H. Wheeler Robinson.

Biblical Doctrines. By Benjamin B. Warfield. Oxford Press. 18s.

There are gathered together in this book a number of articles by th late Dr. Warfield, taken from various Bible Dictionaries, and dealing wit themes ranging from Predestination to Eschatology. The most importan are those treating of the Incarnation and the Atonement, each under number of different aspects.

It is difficult to put into words the impression made by the book on mind accustomed to modern methods in Biblical theology. It would be mere impertinence to praise Dr. Warfield's learning, which appears o every page. Yet the whole result of it is to produce a singular feeling c unreality. The effect is much as if one had put on the " goloshes c Fortune " of Hans Andersen's fairy-tale and had been transported to th

seventeenth century. Dr. Warfield was Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in Princeton University. The very name recalls the great days of the Protestant orthodoxy, when a Reformed theologian like Alsted could write a "Theologia didactica" and a "Theologia polemica." Dr. Warfield might indeed be an Alsted *redivivus,* propounding what he believes to be truth with the same certainty, and attacking all enemies with the same courage. The adversaries, to be sure, are not those of an Alsted. They are no longer the Romanists, the Lutherans, and the Socinians. They are instead Liberal Protestants like Harnack and Sabatier, Anglo-Catholics like Rawlinson, and philosophers like Royce. However archaic Dr. Warfield may be in his positive theology, he is entirely up-to-date in his amazing knowledge of the views of his opponents.

It is not likely, however, that all his scholarship or his polemical energy will hinder the progress of modern thought. "So fight I," said St. Paul, "as one not beating the air." But that is just what Dr. Warfield does: he beats the air. He is like a soldier, thinking to repel an advancing cloud of gas by means of vigorous bayonet-thrusts or blows of the clubbed rifle. If his pre-suppositions were secure, his polemic might be successful. But it is just those pre-suppositions that the ineluctable movement of thought has rendered uncertain.

Dr. Warfield treats the Bible as a book of revealed knowledge, in itself certain and sufficient, quite apart from any interpretation through experience. All that is necessary is to make out the surface-meaning of the Biblical text, using indeed one part to explain another. The historical method simply does not exist for Dr. Warfield. He uses the *Epistle to the Hebrews* to settle the original meaning of the sacrifices of Cain and Abel in *Genesis.* He has no hesitation in accepting the Chalcedonian doctrine of the One Person in two natures as an accurate systematization of Biblical doctrine. His article on the Person of Christ contains no reference to the undoubted Adoptionism of the early chapters of *Acts,* or to the survivals of this primitive point of view still traceable in the midst of St. Paul's higher Christology.

Nevertheless, when all is said, there is instruction to be had from Dr. Warfield. His review of modern theories in the light of Calvinist orthodoxy is searching, and often successfully shows up their weaknesses; while his positive statements of Biblical doctrine, where they are not vitiated by complete lack of historical perspective, furnish much matter for reflexion. An experimental method in theology will necessitate a freer handling of the Biblical text, but anything that throws light on the text itself will assist the final synthesis. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Inward Vision. By R. H. J. STEWART, S.J. Longmans. 5s.

Pascal's Philosophy of Religion. By CLEMENT C. J. WEBB. Milford. 6s.

Kant's Conception of God. By F. E. ENGLAND, M.A., Ph.D. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

The Christian Apprehension of God. By H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.D. Student Christian Movement. 6s.

These four books have to a very considerable extent a common theme. All of them are concerned with God, and all but one are concerned with man's relation to God in religion. Taking them as they stand in the order above given, they represent four successive highly important phases of thought on the great subject common to them all.

Father Stewart's book has been placed first because its fundamental line of thought is the most ancient. It is meditational and devotional in

form, but the meditations it contains rest upon and reveal the solid outline of the Thomist theology, which is now the universally accepted theology o the Roman Church. It is a noble theology, grand in its outlines and firml knit together in its composition. It is a foundation that gives coherenc and sequence to the thought of this book.

According to St. Thomas the first point of doctrine concerning God i that His essence is beyond all our thought. Yet He can be known throug figures and symbols which shadow forth His Divine majesty. The purpos of Father Stewart's book is to exhibit how a number of such symbols lea us from different sides towards the vision of God. "To see through symbol", he says, "is not to abolish it. . . To use symbols arigh means, precisely, to let them point us to that for which they stand".

There is much in the book that is beautiful and helpful; and it may b read with profit by those who are not of the Roman communion.

Professor Webb's book on Pascal, which is a remarkably fine study o that most interesting character, brings before us a very different type o mentality. Pascal was a devout Catholic, but he lived in an age ver different from that of St. Thomas. Instead of the Aristotelian physic from which the Thomist theology found its way to God with comparativ ease, there had come into being the Cartesian physics with its strictl mathematical methods. Pascal was a first-class mathematician an scientist, but his very knowledge distressed him. It became clear to hi that there was no direct way from mathematical science to God. H became the pioneer of what is now known as the argument from religiou experience. One of the most celebrated of all his aphorisms is : "Le cœu a ses raisons que la raison ne connait pas". Another aphorism is : "C'es le cœur qui sent Dieu et non la raison".

Was Pascal a philosopher? Modern French thought assigns to him philosophical position equal to that of Descartes. Professor Webb canno find that he was strictly a philosopher at all. If it is the desire for synoptic view of the universe that above all characterizes a philosophe Pascal was untouched by this desire. Moreover, he quite unphilosophicall at once identifies the revelation of God to the heart with the whol institution of the Roman Catholic Church.

Nevertheless Pascal remains to all time "a religious genius with a styl of extraordinary distinction". In this aspect he will continue to engag the attention of subsequent generations. Such is Professor Webb's fina verdict upon this fascinating personality.

The philosopher whose divided view of things most resembles that o Pascal is Immanuel Kant. Pascal's dualism of the reason and the hea has obvious affinities with Kant's dualism of the theoretical and th practical reason. Professor Webb admits this similarity, though h naturally points out how much more of a philosopher Kant was tha Pascal. Kant's criticism of the theoretical proof for the Divine existenc was closely reasoned in a manner quite unlike the aphoristic way of Pasca Also Kant's practical reason was after all a form of reason : it was ver different from Pascal's "cœur qui sent Dieu".

But still the dualism of Kant is only too evident, and has alienate many from the "Critical philosophy". In a book of real and outstandin merit Dr. England has set himself to draw together the lines of the Kantia philosophy, and to show that the consistent end of its criticism is metaphysical doctrine of God as the ground of the universe and the princip of its teleology. Dr. England traces the development of modern philosoph from Descartes to Kant's *Critiques,* paying special attention to h immediate predecessors, Crusius and Baumgarten, and to Kant's own pr

critical treatises. He reaches the result that Kant's fundamental distinction between the constitutive function of the categories and the regulative function of the ideas cannot be sustained. For it Dr. England would substitute the notion that categories and ideas are alike interpretative modes of thought which arise out of experience through man's determined effort to comprehend it. The result is to transform Kant's critical idealism into a critical realism, in which God appears as the Ground alike of the existence of the universe which is the object of our knowledge, and of its teleological evolution.

> The new is emergent because the universe is dynamic and creative, and its dynamic, purposeful, and creative agency is deity . . . It is possible to conceive God as the sole ultimate individual whose self is confronted by a not-self which, though not external to him, is as real as the content presented to my processes of apprehension when these processes are directed to the events which go to the make-up of my own total personality.

Kant's Conception of God is undoubtedly a book to be seriously considered, but the kind of consideration it requires demands an intimate acquaintance with the details of Kantianism. Dr. England's conclusion is probably sound; but there are some knotty points involved in his arguments. His treatment of the categories especially needs a fresh examination. His view that they are not strictly *a priori* but rise out of experience threatens to destroy the whole Kantian fabric. Yet it is an important link in his chain of argument. By it he proves the categories to be interpretative only, and so reduces the gap between them and the ideas, which he is most urgently concerned to do.

Dr. Mackintosh's *The Christian Apprehension of God* takes us back from metaphysic to religion. It is here contended that while the possibility of a unified view of things must always be pre-supposed by the Christian theist, in practice he will do well to build his conception of God on the value-judgments of religion as these are applied to interpret the historical facts of the Old and New Testaments, especially the great crowning fact of Jesus. On the basis of these pre-suppositions Dr. Mackintosh unfolds the Christian conception of God as the personal Almighty Holy Love. Here he deals with arguments against the personality of God, and also explains in a way that interestingly reminds one of Father Stewart's Thomism, how the three attributes of holiness, love, and omnipotence present only aspects of the same Person, and are not to be understood as if they could ever be in conflict one with another.

Dr. Mackintosh's book is written not professedly for the theologian, but for the general reader. But it contains a synthesis of the best Protestant thought on its subject during the last century. While it is written with great learning behind it, the total result is admirably clear. Not only the general reader, but also the professed theologian cannot fail to gain from reading it.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Mind at the Crossways. By C. LLOYD MORGAN. Williams & Norgate. 10s. 6d.

In this book Dr. Lloyd Morgan carries a stage further the study of human nature which he began in his well-known works *Life, Man and Spirit* and *Emergent Evolution.* As may be gathered from the title, the volume before us is more psychological and is an attempt to construct a theory of mental activity on a purely naturalistic basis, while at the same time allowing for a certain originality and creative activity of the ego.

The book is a very real contribution to the study of the vexed problem o personality and should prove a welcome antidote to the blankly behaviouris attitude which certain modern psychologists have tried to popularize. Dr Lloyd Morgan writes with his usual incisiveness and maintains his cas against all comers. Some of his criticisms of writers from whom he differ are not the least interesting and valuable part of the book. As in hi other books, he comes to a theistic conclusion in the end, though it is a agnostic type of theism. He says, "I believe in the existence of God in dependently of anyone's sentient gospels. But what He is *in Himsel* apart from all references to Him on the part of reflective men and wome I cannot say". This is an echo of a good deal that we find in moder writing on the subject of God, and it at least presents a challenge t Christian theology to build on even the slender foundation thus offered.

W. B. Selbie.

Matter, Life and Value. By C. E. M. Joad. Oxford Press. 18s.

Mr. Joad is a brilliant and copious writer (compare *Congregationa Quarterly* for Jan., 1926, and for July, 1928). He continues to reje monism in every sense of the term. Yet he is willing to admit th possibility that life may be diffused through the whole of matter. Woul not that be a true monism? It needs extraordinary confidence in th power of analytic thought to insist that life and matter, even if they shoul never exist apart, are two heterogeneous things. Again, Mr. Joad hol that evolution has been empirically "discovered". But what guarante have we that a definite evolutionary trend will last five minutes longer i the sort of universe—rather, *multi*verse—in which we are asked to believe More precisely, Mr. Joad's present system is neither dualism nor pluralism but what they used to call in Austrian politics "trialism". The *Life-forc* urges its way through the hindrance of *matter* in endless change; *Value* —like humbler "subsistent" truths—are eternally changeless, and co stitute the only possible goal of evolution. So far as can be seen ahea the end of the world-process is to be impersonal contemplation of the gre Values by the Life-force, made wise through the age-long travail humanity. There is to be no personal immortality. Our "subconsciou ness"—only—will survive. About God, in this present year, Mr. Joa professes "inability to make any positive affirmation" (p. 392). Th author's views on poetry, music, and mysticism are as fresh as the rest his contendings, and perhaps not less perverse.

Robert Mackintosh.

The Theory of Christ's Ethics. By F. A. M. Spencer, D.D. Allen & Unwi 10s. 6d.

Dr. Spencer continues his earlier studies in the same field. *Civilization Remade by Christ* he developed the practical application Christ's ethics to such subjects as war, money, politics, eugenic marriage, and education. The present volume is an enquiry, theoretical intention, into what it was that Christ did in fact teach. His record words are few, but, as Dr. Spencer says, His teaching did not cease at H death, and those who try to get His point of view by the study of H recorded sayings may thereby come into contact with His inspiration no

We cannot follow Dr. Spencer through his enquiry in any detail. T work is thorough, and deals with all the more important questions i volved in the subject, such as the interim-ethic; eschatolog Christ's attitude to the law, force, and persuasion; sin and reward a punishment. The chapters on moralizing the instincts and on the Pharisa

complex are particularly interesting in their application of Christ's teaching to modern points of view. Dr. Spencer has a gift of discernment which enables him to express the imperishable teaching of Christ in the passing phrases of to-day. Perhaps, if we might criticize at all, we might say that there is a note of inevitable coldness in the book. The fire and emotion of the appeal of Jesus is rather quenched by the theoretical treatment. Our Lord's words appeal to faith, to the assent of the whole nature; the intellect, theorizing, cannot reproduce their persuasive power.

H. B. SHEPHEARD.

Wealth and Life. By J. A. HOBSON. Macmillan. 15s.

The economic man, that human counter supposed to be predestined to wealth or poverty by the play of inexorable economic law, died long ago—if indeed he ever lived except as a fiction in the minds of the first writers on political economy. This book is an excellent example of the truer attitude of economists to their problem to-day. They see that wealth and life are related and interdependent. We cannot discuss the distribution of wealth without taking into consideration vital values, what men need in their lives. Man does not live by bread alone: he has a sense of value, and demands culture, leisure, and moral satisfaction. Spiritual needs are as much forces at work in the economic system as are the demands of the body. Needs create supply, and exchange, and all the traffic of the economic system; and, since some needs are spiritual, cultural, and intellectual, spirit and mind and the love of beauty are factors in the economic problem.

Humanitarianism and religion have also broken down the old economic theory. Mr. Hobson says, searchingly for us, that the old Puritan and Nonconformist stock supplied the energy, industry, and competitive enterprise which the industrial revolution required. The acquisition of wealth was regarded as a legitimate, nay, praiseworthy test of personal merit. But a low standard of living for the workers was accepted as a natural condition, the result of the operation of economic laws, established they thought, by God. But conscience, stimulated by Ruskin, Carlyle, and many others, has long since eaten away that belief, and to-day we regard the economic state not as the sphere where every man may get what he can, but as a creation whose function it is to provide for all according to their needs.

Mr. Hobson writes as a political economist conscious of the embarrassment which ethical considerations introduce into his science. But he deals with the resulting situation fully and fairly; first historically, showing the change which has come about; and afterwards, from that half-economic, half-ethical point of view, discussing current theories and suggested remedies, problems very interesting to us at this time—the right place for public control and private enterprise; motives, ambition, and public spirit; service or profit; the world-wide inter-relations of trade and finance; how far economic equality is possible, and other matters both instructive and corrective.

The book is timely and full of good matter frankly and quietly discussed. It is provided with an appropriate appendix containing questions and notes on each chapter, and might well be studied by groups.

H. B. SHEPHEARD.

Stephen Hales, D.D., F.R.S. By A. E. CLARK-KENNEDY, M.D., M.R.C.P. Cambridge Press. 15s.

An account of the life of a man remarkable in many ways, not least in this, that in the first half of the eighteenth century he combined an arduous study of natural and physical science with the life of a devoted

clergyman of a suburban parish, and was never induced by the claims of the one to neglect the duties of the other, in an age when this was done by so many of his brethren with so much less reasonable an excuse.

He came early, when at Cambridge, in contact with Stukeley, the eminent scientist and antiquarian, and it was largely from him that Hales imbibed his taste for experiment; as what scientifically minded young man would not, under such circumstances as these? "We had," writes Stukeley, "an old Cat in the house, which had been a great Favorite of my Fathers and the whole Familys, and by my Mothers leave I rid her of the infirmitys of age, and made a handsom sceleton of her bones, which I carryd to Cambridge with me the next Journey thither . . . . ." Pussy's last obsequies took place, for some unexplained reason, on the slopes of the Gogmagogs.

After leaving Cambridge, in 1709, Hales became perpetual Curate of Teddington, which cure he retained for the whole of his life, more than once refusing preferment. From that time on his life was a continuous investigation into natural and physical laws, beginning with studies of the circulation of the blood, the pressure of which he was the first to measure, by means of some ingenious and rather weird experiments. He discovered the nature, if not the exact composition, of carbon dioxide, and suggested the use, for the first time, of respirators. He devoted a great part of his life to fighting the gin traffic, and in their different ways Hales and Hogarth may be said to have had the chief hand in abolishing, or at least repressing, that terrible scourge.

Hales played a great part in founding the American colony of Georgia, and so incidentally became responsible for the sending out of Charles and John Wesley, to "convert the Negroes in the British Plantations to Christianity," an adventure which for the Wesleys turned out rather unfortunately.

Perhaps his principal success from a sociological point of view was his introduction of ventilators into slave-ships, ships of the line, gaols, *etc.*, by which many thousands of lives must have been saved. A list of his lesser inventions fills a page, from which we learn that, *inter alia,* civilization owes to him the discovery of the inverted egg-cup in a pie, for preserving the juices thereof. And "though a man of a Baronet's family . . . . . he was found in his later years much busied in painting white with his own hands the top of the footpath posts, that his neighbours might not be injured by running against them in the dark."

Altogether a readable account of a man whose name should be better known than it is.

H. N. Dixon.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

(*Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.*)

The Speaker's Bible, Mark, Vol. II (9s. 6d.) deals with the last seven chapters of the Gospel, and also contains an index to Vols. X-XVIII of the series. The volume contains the same features that we have noticed in previous volumes. Interpretation is drawn from all quarters, including some recent literature—witness Miss Padwick's *Temple Gairdner of Cairo,* the Rev. A. D. Martin's *Aspects of the Way,* and the Rev. G. A. Buttrick's *The Parables of Jesus.*

Mr. Harry Kendall Booth, whose *Background of the Bible* was hailed as a useful production, has followed it up by *The Bridge between the*

Testaments (Scribners, 7s. 6d.), in which he surveys the life and literature from the time of Ezra to the Apostolic age. There are maps and tables showing the main events and the literature of the different periods, which Mr. Booth divides thus: Persian Rule (527-332); Greek Rule (372[1]-320); Egyptian Rule (320-198); Syrian Rule (198-143); Independence (143-63); Roman Rule (63-37); Herodian Rule (37-44 A.D.). Scholars will disagree with Mr. Booth at this point and at that, but for the general reader who desires an acquaintance with the life and religious literature of the period the book is very serviceable.

All who delighted in Mr. John Oxenham's *The Hidden Years* will welcome *God's Candle* (Longmans, 4s. and 2s. 6d.), in which he surveys the Gospel narrative of the Crucifixion from the points of view of the Centurion, Judas, Barabbas, Simon of Cyrene, *etc.* The chapter on Barabbas is specially well done.

Mr. A. J. Farnsworth's *A Psalm that has made Heroes* (Sharp, 2s.) tells of historic occasions in which *Ps.* 46 figured.

Dr. T. R. Glover moves with the assured tread of a native about the highways and by-ways of ancient Greece and Rome, and he points out many things that we should miss as we go along. In *The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World* (Cambridge Press, 5s.) he sets out to answer the question, "What was it in Christ or in Christianity that beat down Venus and Jupiter, Isis and Osiris, Cybele and Mithras?". His answer is "because it squared best with the world's best intelligence, because essentially it liberated the human mind", because, in short, "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty". We are not sure that, pleasant as the lectures are, they are quite conclusive: suggestive, rather, and sometimes severe, as on Mr. R. T. Herford. The eulogy of Tertullian pleased us.

Two books follow which deal with the period covered by Dr. Glover, and in some degree with the same subject—Prof. S. Angus's *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (Murray, 15s.—a cheap price for such a book) and Prof. H. R. Willoughby's *Pagan Regeneration* (Chicago Univ. Press, 13s. 6d.). Both are books which must be mastered by those who would gain a right understanding of early Christianity by first obtaining a proper idea of its *milieu*. Dr. Angus's *The Mystery Religions and Christianity* immediately took rank as an authority, and he has now developed the same theme. Was there a pagan, as well as a Jewish, preparation for Christianity? What were the religious ideas and practices of the century into which Christianity came? Dr. Angus sets himself to answer these questions; he faces again the problems of the relation of Christianity to the Mystery Religions, and of the place and meaning of sacraments—here turning aside to discuss the function of sacraments to-day. Then he discusses astrology, hermeticism, and gnosticism, concluding with an examination of religion as a therapeutic in the Græco-Roman days.

Prof. Willoughby's field is narrower, but his treatment is quite as thorough. His task is to investigate mystery initiations as a prolegomenon to a study of the mystical experience of Paul. Having examined the causes for the popularity of the Mystery cults, he endeavours to find the significance of the initiation rites. Popularity and initiation are bound up together, for initiation secures the gifts that make the cult popular—new birth, new life in mystical experience, and salvation

[1] We follow Mr. Booth's dates.

through an alliance with the lord of the cult which robs the unknow spiritual world of its terrors and gives the assurance of happy immortalit

We like the frank earnestness and the wholesome simplicity of the Re Francis Underhill's *Prayer in Modern Life* (Mowbray, 5s.), and we tru that many will be led by it to discover that reasonableness in prayer tha the book urges.

The lurid cover and title of the Rev. Percy Dearmer's *The Legend Hell* (Cassell, 7s. 6d.) suggest something sensational rather than scholarly treatise. Dr. Dearmer outlines the history of the belief eternal punishment, and then examines the New Testament evidence for i

Another Anglican dignitary, the Dean of Chester, takes quite anothe line in *The Resurrection of the Dead* (Chapman & Hall, 5s.). He feels n difficulty at all about the Athanasian Creed, and finds natural immortalit or universalism repugnant and entirely unscriptural. It is a common erro to think of human immortality apart from the resurrection of Jesus : huma immortality is possible only where goodness is. This belief in condition immortality is, the Dean believes, in accord with the teaching both Jesus and of modern science. A suggestive book, rather overloaded wit quotations, which makes one marvel how it is possible to write c conditional immortality and not mention Edward White.

We strongly recommend the Rev. H. W. Fox's **The Child's Approac to Religion* (Williams & Norgate, 3s. 6d.), not only to parents, but to a who have dealings with young people. It is one of the best books that w have seen for showing how Christianity can be taught in such a way tha there will be nothing to unlearn in future years. The words of the Bisho of Liverpool's Introduction are altogether justified :—"I know of no boo which sets forth so clearly and attractively a course of Christian teachin definite and sympathetic. I know of many parents, including myself, wh need and want exactly what it offers, and I think I can promise that it w help them to teach not only their children but themselves."

Dr. George Stewart's *Can I Teach My Child Religion?* (S.C.M., 3s deals with a similar problem, but not, we think, so successfully. D Stewart's approach is psychological, and only a part of his book is devote to the subject suggested in the title. The best things in it are the i sistence on the effect of a parent's own behaviour on a child, and the boo list in the last chapter.

With Mr. Fox's book we put Dr. Alington's **Doubts and Difficulti* (Longmans, 5s. and 3s. 6d.), in which the Headmaster of Eton accepts th challenge to write an apologetic for Christianity in non-technical term The result is excellent, and we hope that young people in all the church will read the book. Partly in the form of a dialogue with husband an wife, partly in letters to the wife, Dr. Alington manages to bring out an extremely attractive way the centralities of the Christian faith. H never shirks the problems nor loses himself in a cloud of words. It encouraging to think that the youth of Eton are in such sane and sensib hands.

It is not easy to see how Mr. J. H. Tuckwell's *The Faith of the Futu* (Methuen, 5s.) fits into Dr. Jacks's "The Faiths" series. It is a strang book, at once naïve and provocative. Christianity, Mr. Tuckwell hold did not originate with Jesus in His earthly life, but is a Mystery cult whi had its birth on Græco-Roman soil.

It is a continuation, in some respects at a higher level, of the Mystery cults which it was ultimately successful in displacing. It is an interim religion, holding a place in the minds of the still undeveloped masses of humanity, but itself destined to pass away at such time as reason comes to its maturity, and humanity discovers at length that what it has been seeking to obtain from without already exists implicitly within, waiting exfoliation.

("Exfoliate", by the way, is Mr. Tuckwell's pet word: we are always meeting it). The only alternative religions in the future are "Reason and Rome", and Mr. Tuckwell finds the religion of reason in the New Thought of America, a higher pantheism which will be the religion of the future, people then having discovered that it is not necessary to be a Christian to be religious. The words of Euripides, "Reason in each one of us is God", may be said to be the motto of the faith of the future, and Mr. Tuckwell shows how Catholicism and Unitarianism will relate themselves to it. For the churches between he has little sympathy and little hope—and, we think, little understanding.

The conception of Mr. C. W. Ferguson's *The Confusion of Tongues* (Heinemann, 12s. 6d.) is so admirable that we cannot help regretting that the working-out falls so much below the possibility. "A review of modern 'isms' ", summarizing the history and the tenets of the leading cults that make so much stir in the America of to-day could have been extremely useful. And up to a point it is, for Mr. Ferguson has an observant eye and a lucid style. But he is often flippant, and there is an atmosphere about the sketches that is displeasing, for there are many sincere people even in the most frothy of the "isms"—even among the followers of Aimée Semple Macpherson, the Unity School, and the 4A (the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism). We do not know whether Mr. Ferguson is responsible for the jacket, but it illustrates the book's main weaknesses. It reads, "Some Sure Ways to be Saved":

Deny death, evil, sin, disease. - - - -	Christian Science.
Choose likely parents for your next embodiment.	Theosophy.
Help build a cathedral of thought-gelatin. -	Liberal Catholics.
Breathe properly, and concentrate on the solar plexus.	Swamis & Yogis.
Talk with the spirits of the great. - - -	Spiritualism.
Confess in detail and obtain like confessions. -	Buchmanism.

The book aggravates, too, by the frequency of its slips and misprints—we have noticed them on pp. 15, 29, 69, 75, 145, 217, 247, 284, 322 (two in consecutive lines), 389, 433. American printers can do better than this.

The Rev. P. B. Clayton's **Plain Tales from Flanders* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) is an antidote to some of the sordid and squalid war books that have recently been the rage. It tells of bravery and sacrifice, and of the presence and the following of Christ mid shot, shell, wounds, and death. Mr. Clayton's are the sort of sketches that all men who are enabled by other men's sacrifice to share in the building of a new world should read many a time and oft—so easily do we forget that our lives are mortgaged up to the hilt.

Seeing that his output is so regular, the Rev. F. W. Boreham keeps it up amazingly well. Anything can start him off—the memory of a clockwork mouse given him one Christmas, the Ibsen centenary, a climb to an eagle's nest. This time the result is *The Three Half-Moons* (Epworth Press, 5s.). Mr. Boreham must be as hard put to it to find titles as were the parents of an old-time family of twenty to find names.

Right down to the end, W. L. Watkinson made sermons when he could not preach them, and *The Stability of the Spiritual* (Sharp, 3s. 6d.) contains eleven characteristic sermons written in the last months of his life. There is an appreciation by the Rev. G. Beesley Austin.

From The Tops of the Hills (Sharp, 5s.) is a memorial volume to the late Arthur Hoyle. It consists of papers written for the *Methodist Recorder* during a long period of years—lively papers by one who was in touch with the throbbing life of large communities. It would have been to the advantage of the book had a brief memoir been prefixed, and each essay dated.

Many who do not know the Rev. Harold E. Brierley will welcome anything he writes for the sake of the name he bears: there are still hundreds of people up and down the country, and not ministers only, who remember the debt that they owe to "J.B.". But the "Sermons on the Things that Matter Most" which Mr. Brierley prints in *Life Indeed* (Clark, 7s.) are worth reading for their own sake. Mr. Brierley has not his father's range of illustration, but he has the courage of his convictions.

He is a bold man who would survey *Religion in Human Affairs* (Chapman & Hall, 17s. 6d.) from its unknown beginning down to—well, not merely the present, for the last chapter is "Faith and Philosophy of the Future". Dr. Clifford Kilpatrick, of the University of Pennsylvania, has attempted the task, and he shows himself to have read both widely and wisely in preparation for it.

We do not think the book is altogether well proportioned: a good deal of space is given to origins and to magic, and perhaps not enough to the part religion has played in the ordinary everyday life of the individual. There are, too, abundant evidences throughout that the book is of American origin. The diagram is a good deal in evidence: we have, *e.g.*, a diagram reproducing Giddings's "Distribution of Personality Types by Sects"—the types being idio-motor, idio-emotional, dogmatic-emotional and critical-intellectual. No "sect" reaches the last classification, but Congregationalism, with others, comes between 3 and 4.

A full and suggestive book, with a long, selected bibliography.

Next we have a group of books on the history of the Church.

All Dr. Carnegie Simpson writes is workmanlike and scholarly, and *The Church and the State* (Clarke, 6s.) is extremely serviceable at the present time. It surveys—omitting the Orthodox Church—the relations of Church and State during the nineteen centuries of Christian history. A book to keep at hand for reference.

The Rev. C. P. S. Clarke's *Short History of the Christian Church* (Longmans, 10s. 6d.) must have entailed a good deal of work. Within limits it is extremely useful, but what those limits are it is easy to see when the book is put side by side with Williston Walker's *History of the Christian Church,* where one is always conscious of judicial impartiality and of the authority that springs from first-hand knowledge of sources.

When contact between the Orthodox Church and Western Christendom is being restored it is useful to have an authoritative account of the Church's doctrine, polity, worship, and history. That has been provided in Mr. D. A. Lowrie's translation of Dr. Stefan Zankov's *The Eastern Orthodox Church* (S.C.M., 5s.), six lectures delivered in Berlin and published under the title, *Das Orthodoxe Christentum des Ostens.*

In 180 pp. the Bishop of Chichester's *A Brief Sketch of the Church of England* (S.C.M., 4s. and 2s. 6d.) summarizes the history, worship

organization, and outlook of the Church of England, and gives an account of its relation with other Churches.

Dr. C. S. Phillips's *The Church in France,* 1789-1848 (Mowbray, 15s.) is a readable volume which fills a gap for the English reader. We know no book in English which deals so succinctly with the French Church in and subsequent to the Revolution period.

Thirteen Methodists from the three uniting denominations describe in *Methodism and the Modern World* (Sharp, 6s.) the history, the message, and the mission of Methodism. The volume is edited by Dr. Scott Lidgett and the Rev. B. H. Reed.

It would almost be easier to make a list of the subjects on which Mr. Kenneth Ingram's *Has the Church Failed?* (Allan, 5s.) does not touch than of those it includes. There are penetrating sections in it, but the easy assurance with which he writes is evidently in some places the assurance of ignorance. He certainly does not know that "had the reforms of Erasmus prevailed, and had Luther not existed, the world would be a much happier and better place to-day", and he would be hard put to it to prove that "Dances are organized by the strictest Baptists in aid of chapel funds". Our readers will be glad to learn that, according to this Anglo-Catholic, "Nonconformist sermons are usually intelligent reviews of social and moral problems, and sometimes they reveal a considerable intellectual merit". Despite some good things the book cannot be considered a serious contribution.

The Rev. R. Pyke's *The Protestant Faith and Challenge* (Sharp, 3s. 6d.) does not pretend to be more than a survey of the Reformation and of Reformation doctrine for an ordinary congregation. But even then it should have mentioned Calvin!

The Reunion of Christendom (Cassell, 7s. 6d.) is a survey of the present position by writers representing various Churches. Cardinal Bourne and Archbishop Germanos write for the Roman and Eastern Churches; the Free Church contributors are Dr. Garvie and Dr. Scott Lidgett; there is no Baptist; and Dr. Orchard concludes with "A Vision of the Reunited Church".

The Rt. Hon. H. A. L. Fisher has enjoyed writing *Our New Religion* (Benn, 6s.) and we have enjoyed reading it. The book is a study of Christian Science, and Mr. Fisher makes full use of the ample opportunity for irony that Christian Science and its founder present. His three chapters deal with "The Prophetess", "The Creed", and "The Church", and together they form an adequate—and, we think, a fair—picture of Christian Science. Mr. Fisher thinks that Christian Science is too soundly entrenched, both as a financial corporation and in its ability to take credit for healings, to follow countless other American sects into speedy oblivion: the only thing that could destroy it would be to show effectively that it is not Christian.

A new series, published under the auspices of the English Church Union, is the "Anglican Library of Faith and Thought" (Longmans, 4s. and 2s. 6d.). The Editor is the Rev. L. Prestige, and the first three volumes are the Rev. C. J. Shebbeare's *Problems of Providence* (a thoughtful piece of apologetic), the Rev. A. Chandler's *Christian Religious Experience,* and Canon T. A. Lacey's *The Reformation and the People* (sound, but taking no cognizance of much recent work).

Sisyphus (Kegan Paul, 2s. 6d.) is a fascinating little essay on "the future of psychology", in which Mr. M. Jaeger is specially concerned

with behaviourism. Having decided "that this cussed human nature ours is singularly unamenable to the scientific method", he concludes thus "Science has, in general, the air of becoming less and less nearly exact it mounts higher. When it reaches man's higher faculties, there may found to be a debatable ground where intellect gradually gives place action as the only available means to understanding".

From the future of psychology we turn back to *The History Psychology* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.), which Dr. W. B. Pillsbury has relate in 320 pp., beginning with the Egyptians and the Greeks, and ending wi the Gestalt and Understanding Schools. The pages dealing with mode psychology are very useful for reference, and the photographs a interesting—we have J. B. Watson, Freud, Adler, and Köhler on one pag

Sir James Jeans's little book *Eos* had prepared us for a treat in *T Universe Around Us* (Cambridge Press, 12s. 6d.), and we have not bee disappointed. It is but rarely that the reading of a book challenges us sit down to work, notebook in hand, until we have absolutely mastered i contents, but that is the feeling we have at present. Bewildered, course, by the magnitude of the universe revealed to us, thrilled by i beauty, and impressed and awed by its laws, we are also moved by man achievements in discovering so much about it in the brief span of huma life. Sir James has apt illustration at his command, and his analogi prove very useful: he writes well and those prepared to use their brai need not fear to tackle the book. They will have all manner of thrill Having begun to shiver with fright at the discovery that the sun is, so speak, on the edge of a precipice and liable to shrink into a "white-dwar star, they will suddenly be re-assured to learn that the 3 per cent. decrea in luminosity which means falling over the precipice cannot take less tha 150 million years, while it is unlikely that the actual fall will occur in und a million million years. The earth's temperature will then be 30 deg. lower, the mountains will have become plains, and the seas and rive ice: life will be routine rather than adventure, for the human race will doomed to extinction. But wait! Venus will then have cooled sufficient to entertain mankind, and—though Sir James Jeans does not say this— that time there should be a big Celestial Furniture Removing Trust work.

Mr. J. D. Bernal's *The World, The Flesh and the Devil* (Routledg 2s. 6d.) discusses the possibility of the future in the light of the thr "enemies of the rational soul". He envisages a state in which man h colonized space and mechanized the body, having extended consciousne by attaching new nerve-centres to his brain: the sublimation of sex w have developed so that a part will go to research, and a larger part æsthetic creation. As remote as it is entertaining.

It is a pity that a person of the standing and intelligence of M Bertrand Russell should so frequently stoop to gibes and sneers in l published works. A little of the cool detachment of the mathemati philosophy would be very welcome when Mr. Russell is dealing with di cult social questions. Very often he goes far out of his way to ma offensive remarks. What, for example, has this to do with *Marriage a Morals* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.)?

> The Pelaw Islanders believe that the perforation of the nose is necessa for winning eternal bliss. Europeans think that this end is better attain by wetting the head while pronouncing certain words. The belief of Pelaw Islanders is a superstition; the belief of the Europeans is one of truths of our holy religion.

This, of course, quite ignores the fact that millions of Europeans do not believe in baptismal regeneration; but in any case Mr. Russell's reference is of the lowest Hyde Park orator type.

Mr. Russell never hesitates to drag in an attack on Christianity, of which he knows next to nothing, while he makes no attempt at all to be fair. When we remember how Jesus joined together love for God and love for neighbour, what are we to make of statements like, "In the ethic of Christianity, it is the relation of the soul to God that is important, not the relation of man to his fellow men"?

Mr. Russell's book is a plea for greater freedom in sex relations. He writes as a strong supporter of companionate marriage and would dissociate the elements of procreation and pleasure that enter into the sexual relationship. But no matter how clever a man might be, a discussion of this kind cannot be usefully conducted in a spirit of sneering cynicism.

That having been said, it ought to be said, too, that the Churches are failing to face the new situation in regard to sexual questions. The new freedom of women, the surplus number of women, and the widespread knowledge of contraceptives have given the problem an entirely new aspect. Thousands of ministers and deacons would have the shock of their lives if they knew the way in which their young people regarded (in theory and in practice) old sexual standards and conventions.

**Birth Control and Human Integrity* (Independent Press, 1s. 6d.), by the Master of Balliol and Mrs. Lindsay, is a timely little book. It is a plea for a sense of responsibility in regard to sex relations, and especially in those engaged in birth control propaganda. The use of contraceptives is being indiscriminately urged long before even the medical profession is prepared to speak with confidence about its physical and psychical results, and it is doing great harm among married and unmarried alike. Dr. and Mrs. Lindsay ask that supporters of the propaganda should be clear in their aims and objects, should avoid hasty publicity and consequent overemphasis, should discover and state the disadvantages as well as the advantages of the methods advocated, and should "realize the immediate necessity of getting regulations passed with regard to the advertisement, display, and sale of contraceptives". We hope ministers will make a point of reading this book: it will help them greatly in the most difficult pastoral problem of to-day.

To balance it they might turn to Dr. Marie C. Stopes's *Mother England* (Bale, Danielsson, 10s. 6d.), though we do not recommend anybody to read this book who has not a strong stomach. It is described as "A Contemporary History, Self-written by those who have had no historian." Apparently, writing in *John Bull*, Dr. Stopes invited correspondence: here she prints samples of letters received during 1926 by those who sought her advice. How far one is justified in printing intimate letters of this kind, even without names, is doubtful. They are infinitely pathetic and sometimes heartrending. Often crude and badly spelt, they are in many cases from poor women with large families in crowded rooms, often too by those who have been warned that child-birth will mean probable loss of life. Here we see plainly the indignation of the poor at the withholding of knowledge obtainable by the rich, and at the refusal of the medical profession to advise them how to prevent conception.

A book like this is, without doubt, very effective propaganda for some form of education in sexual hygiene. Those doubtful about instruction in methods of birth control will probably claim that the writers of these letters are abnormal cases which should receive definite medical guidance. Dr.

Stopes would reply that they are typical cases, and that in three mont she has received no less than 20,000 requests for advice as to how to pr cure criminal abortion, the widespread nature of which practice, she hold is producing disastrous results in maternal mortality and in female heal generally.

The whole subject bristles with difficulties. There is no doubt that t indiscriminate advocacy of contraceptives has done much harm, and y Dr. Stopes's book presents a terrible picture. There is great need for t sense of responsibility urged by Dr. and Mrs. Lindsay, and for a thorou analysis of all the data obtainable about the results of the use of contr ceptives. We cannot refrain from saying that the medical profession h been greatly to blame for shirking this problem. On every hand peop troubled in mind seem to have sought medical counsel in vain.

Mrs. Soltau's *The Free Woman* (S.C.M., 6s.) bears the cumbrous su title, "Some Inferences from the Thoughts of Jesus Christ in Relation Problems of Personality and Womanhood". Mrs. Soltau is right holding that while in Christ woman should find perfect freedom, yet t Church has not merely kept woman in subjection in the past, but even y does little to secure her full liberty. Mrs. Soltau shows how modern li still puts upon women an unfair share of the burden, and asks ho woman's desire for independent work is to be met. A thoughtful boo full of commonsense.

The Religious Basis of World Peace (Williams & Norgate, 6s.—a st price) contains the addresses delivered at a Conference convened at Prag in August, 1928, by the World Alliance for Promoting Internation Friendship Through the Churches. There are twelve addresses by men different nationalities and religious affiliation.

Dr. R. H. Murray is one of the most industrious scholars of our tim and his labours are generally directed to most useful ends. Ma students, within the Universities and without, will be grateful for h *Studies in the English Social and Political Thinkers of the Nineteen Century* (Heffer, 2 vols., 12s. 6d. each), Vol. I of which covers t ground from Malthus to Kingsley, Vol. II from Spencer to the prese Prime Minister. No more can be done in this review than to give a l of names, merely stating that Dr. Murray gives apt commentary on ea and a list of books for reference. We have Malthus, Bentham, M Owen, Coleridge, Disraeli, a glimpse at the Church as seen in the Oxfo Movement and the Disruption in Scotland, Carlyle, Cobden, J. S. M and Kingsley in Vol. I, Spencer, Maine, Ruskin, Matthew Arno Bagehot, Green, Bryce, Maitland, and "Socialism" in Vol. II.

Professor Ramsay Muir's *British History* (Philip, 7s. 6d.) is a tr remarkable achievement—and from two points of view: it is a marvel compression, summarizing the history of the British peoples (not mer the history of England) from the earliest times to 1929; and it is eminen fair and impartial, even in its account of recent English politics, in wh Mr. Ramsay Muir has himself had a part. The book, though an entir new work, is in some sense an abridgment of the *Short History of British Commonwealth.* Our only criticism is in regard to the rat summary treatment of the years preceding 1485, though perhaps this v unavoidable when stress was to be laid on post-Colonial days.

Sir Alexander Cardew's *The White Mutiny* (Constable, 12s. 6d.) two objects—to "rescue from oblivion" the story of the mutiny of Brit

officers in India in 1809, and to do justice to Sir George Barlow, the Governor, by whose firmness and courage, Sir Alexander believes, the situation was saved. The result is a piece of historical research which certainly wins our sympathies for Barlow and at the same time makes scenes of a century ago live vividly before us.

Dr. Wm. Law Mathieson has already written on *British Slavery and Its Abolition,* dealing with the story as far as the year 1838. In *Great Britain and The Slave Trade, 1839-1865* (Longmans, 12s. 6d.) he resumes the narrative, prefixing an Introduction which summarizes the state of affairs between 1807 and 1833. Dr. Mathieson writes well, and brings out both the horrors of the trade and the varied endeavours made to continue it—and also the unremitting efforts of many in this country to suppress it. We are reminded once again of Lecky's dictum : "The unweary, unostentatious and inglorious crusade of England against slavery may probably be regarded as among the three or four virtuous pages comprised in the history of nations".

We wish all towns were fortunate enough to have a chronicler like Mr. Reginald L. Hine, the second volume (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) of whose *History of Hitchin* has now appeared. This volume deals fully and well with the history of Nonconformity in the town, and completes a work of which the author has every reason to be proud.

Mr. F. J. Gould's *The Pioneers of Johnson's Court* (Watts, 2s. 6d.) is an illustrated dictionary of "Rationalist" biography. It is useful in that it gives the facts about persons prominent in the work of the R.P.A. since its foundation in 1899, but it is disfigured by cheap allusions and by extravagant claims like that on p. 50, where we are told to thank the Agnostic for the freedom of women on "the sunny tennis-courts of 1929". A list of legacies shows that the R.P.A. has received nearly £40,000 through this channel.

Most readers of these pages could compile a more striking list of quotations to show the change "which has come over the minds of the educated clergy" than Mr. C. T. Gorham's *A Note-book for Christians* (Watts, 2s. 6d.), a very tame collection mainly from the writings of "Modern Churchmen".

Vol. IV of *The Diary of a Country Parson* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.) brings our old friend, James Woodforde, before us once more. The volume covers the years 1793-1796, and the diary is to be completed in the next volume. The entries have the same characteristics as those in previous years—menus of meals (some of them of considerable length) being general, and comments on the dishes common :

> November 10, 1794. . . Dinner to-day—Bullocks Heart boiled (according to Dr. Thornes recommendation) and a Pheasant rosted. N.B., a Bullock's Heart boiled is a Bullock's Heart spoiled. We think a rost one far preferable . . . The Pheasant though a Hen was very hard. It must be a very old one.

Visits to his family in the West Country are again described. Who would not like to be "put down at the White Hart in Stall Street kept by Pickwick and Wife and there we supped and slept, and a very excellent House it is, everything so good and neat, etc."?

There are references to the French Revolution and the War, and its effect is seen in the rising prices. Woodforde, however, seems more concerned with his health than with politics, and we hear much about his interior, his gout, and a troublesome "ancle".

The country clergyman of the eighteenth century, if Woodforde be a type, seems to have spent most of his time visiting, eating, and attending to his land and stock. There is little sign of reading, though Woodforde does pay a small bill for books in Norwich occasionally: probably these books were similar to the pamphlet lent him by his curate, "Count Rumford's Essay on smoaking Chimnies, and how to be perfectly cured".

We have spent a pleasant hour with Dr. F. W. Hilles's *Letters of Sir Joshua Reynolds* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.), which is more than we can say about some other Ph.D. theses. Dr. Hilles has collected from various sources 160 letters, 42 of which have not been previously published. They are ably documented, and give a pleasing picture of the great man, though they contain little or nothing that is new.

Mr. Norman H. Baynes's *A Bibliography of the Works of J. B. Bury* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.) is a model piece of work of its kind. The bibliography will naturally appeal only to specialists, but many who have used Bury's works and tried to attend his lectures will read the memoir with great interest. Whether we think first of Bury as a philosopher of history, as a "researcher", or as a vigorous protagonist for "freedom of thought", as the "rationalist" conceives it, we are obliged to recognize in him a remarkable combination of qualities.

It is safe to say that no man but Mr. Baynes could have written the memoir. He is one of few competent to estimate the value of Bury's Byzantine work, and his discussion of Bury's view of history is both good and fair, while he does not overlook the weaknesses of Bury's outlook and method—his lack of the sense of proportion, and his failure to give ecclesiastical history its due place. Altogether a piece of work for which historians can be grateful.

It has often been said that Roman Catholicism is kept alive and powerful by the saints it grows. Mr. W. E. Brown conceived the idea of describing the lives of such saints. The first five he selects—Ambrose, Martin, Wilfrid, Boniface, and Dunstan—all turn out to be *Bishops* (Sands, 3s. 6d.), under which title the book is published.

In the "Saints" series (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.) we welcome a translation, by Mr. J. L. Stoddard, of Mgr. Pierre Batiffol's *Saint Gregory the Great,* duly authorized for Roman Catholic reading.

Miss Gollock's "biographical study", *Eugene Stock* (C.M.S., 3s. 6d.) will be greatly appreciated by all interested in the vast enterprise of foreign missions. Stock lived to be ninety-two, and for a quarter of a century after his retirement from the Editorial Secretaryship of the C.M.S. continued to exercise a wide influence, not merely on the work of his own Society, but on missionary work in general. The Church of England was fortunate indeed in having a layman of his conspicuous gifts to serve in a responsible post through a difficult period.

Although Dr. G. F. Barbour quotes words spoken of Henry Drummond, that one cannot "write the history of a fragrance", yet his memoir of *Katherine Scott* (Blackwood, 3s. 6d.) is a beautiful tribute to a saintly life. Born in 1884, the daughter of Lord Polwarth, Katherine Scott worked as Woman Patrol in Hawick in the early years of the war. Afterwards she became one of the Social Work Secretaries of the Church of Scotland and Police Court Sister and Probation Officer. It was in this last capacity that Katherine Scott did her best work, described in her own sketches printed in this little volume. She died in 1928, and Dr. Norman

Maclean's words express what her friends felt and what readers of this memoir must feel with them:

> She worked with all her strength and with all her love to reclaim the lost. In every girl and woman she saw a sister in Christ, and gave them all a sister's love. She had the secret which alone makes it possible to save—she gave herself. The world is poorer because she is gone . . . We do not praise her; she would not like to be praised. We only humbly ask God that we may be inspired to follow in her footsteps.

If you are a serious person and easily annoyed, you had better not read Mr. Martin Shaw's *Up to Now* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.). But if you are not too critical, and not easily put off by references to people which sometimes seemed to be dragged in after the manner of a column of society gossip, and if you want to while away an hour, you will enjoy this ambling narrative. Mr. Martin Shaw's life story will not please the Samuel Smiles type, but it has much of the vitality and freshness, as well as much of the jerkiness and superficiality, that seem characteristic of modern youth. It contains some very good stories.

Sir Arthur Yapp's *The Adventure of Youth* (Longmans, 4s. and 2s. 6d.) is a twentieth century Samuel Smiles. It consists of twenty-seven papers, each of which puts before modern youth adventure in some sphere of thought or action, with the Y.M.C.A., of course, specially emphasized.

We cannot essay with pleasure the easy task of criticizing the late Bramwell Booth's *These Fifty Years* (Cassell, 7s. 6d.), "reminiscences of Army work and warfare, prior to 1912". There are some good things in it, but perhaps the most intriguing is Bramwell Booth's criticism of Marie Corelli's *The Treasure of Heaven* as "marred by overmuch sentimentalism"!

In *An Eskimo Village* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.) Dr. S. K. Hutton describes his work on the Labrador Coast. It is a moving account of missionary activity.

Mr. Hugh Kingsmill's *After Puritanism* (Duckworth, 8s. 6d.) is a very clever and intensely interesting, if sometimes unpleasant, book. It is an examination of the "disintegration of Puritanism" between the years 1850 and 1890, and consists of studies of Dean Farrar, Samuel Butler, Frank Harris, and W. T. Stead. All four are well done, though there is a cynicism about it all, specially evident in the sketch of Stead, which jars on the reader. There is something on nearly every page which starts thought or incites contradiction, though at times Mr. Kingsmill is in danger of degenerating into the merely smart—as when the heading of an *Evening News* article, "Awful Death in a Brewery", is dragged in to say that Mr. G. K. Chesterton would consider this "a contradiction in terms".

Readers who remember General A. W. Greely's article in our pages describing part of his own polar expedition will welcome his *Polar Regions in the Twentieth Century* (Harrap, 12s. 6d.). This useful account of Polar Exploration is the work of a magnificent octogenarian who fought through the American Civil War, and was the first American private to become a general, and who endured great hardships during his expedition, now nearly fifty years ago. The book deals more with the North Pole than with the South, and naturally gives a disproportionate space to those years of which the author can say *quorum magna pars fui*, but nevertheless it is a valuable record. A reviewer who has visited General Greely in

his summer home in the White Mountains, and heard some of these ex periences from his own lips, cannot but give a special welcome to the book

> " Let me not live until my flame lacks oil,
> To be the snuff of younger spirits."

We could not keep these words out of our minds as we turned th pages of Georges Clemenceau's *In the Evening of my Thought* (Constable 2 vols., 30s.). The book itself cannot be described in better words tha the author's :

> " I am eighty-six years old and I am nearing the end. I approach th portals of death and I see before me the Angel Gabriel with his trumpe He says to me, ' Have you anything to say before you pass these portals? And I turn to him and reply, ' I should think I had something to say and I say it here in this book.' "

The Angel Gabriel would evidently be kept waiting for some time, fo these volumes contain over 1,000 pp. He would hear—or will be hearing— about "The World and Man", "Men and Gods", "Gods and Laws" "Dreaming and Thinking", "Knowing", "Symbols", "Cosmogonies Revelation, Song, Poetry, Metaphysics", "Cosmology", "The Atom" "Our Planet", "Evolution", "The Primitive Ages", "Civilization" "And Hereafter?". And no doubt at the end Clemenceau will hav forced the gates, for he has generally managed to get his own way. Th final "word" of his is a characteristic *tour de force,* a typical conclusio to a life that has been packed full with labour and enterprise.

Miss Ellen Chase's *Tenant Friends in Old Deptford* (Williams Norgate, 7s. 6d.) takes us back forty years, for it tells of Miss Chase experiences as one of Miss Octavia Hill's collectors between 1886 an 1891. The book was written in the main before Miss Hill's death, but ha only now been completed for publication. It gives an excellent accou of the work of the collectors, and some of the chapters are extremely we done—that on Mrs. Singleton being a conspicuous example. Canc Barnett's name is misspelt on p. 210.

It is extremely valuable to have the first-hand observations of a Britis traveller in India. Mr. H. G. Alexander, a Quaker bird-lover, with special concern about opium, visited India in 1928; living largely wi Indians, he believes that he has learned far more about the India character in three months than many Englishmen learn in thirty year He saw Gandhi and Tagore, and C. F. Andrews writes an Introductio to his narrative, which he calls *The Indian Ferment* (Williams & Norgat 7s. 6d.). Mr. Alexander was told by Gandhi, "first, we want you to g off our backs", and he has been confirmed in his opinion that Britain h only two alternatives, to rule by the sword, or to withdraw and yield f responsibility to India. His journeyings reveal how this opinion w forced upon him time after time. It is a pity that the book is disfigur by violent onslaughts on Miss Mayo (and by " Calcatta " on p. 88) for should render good service. It ends with asking whether Britain to-d possesses a Campbell-Bannerman.

Another book on India is Mr. Edwyn Bevan's *Thoughts on Indian D contents* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.). It is both gratifying and heartening find a scholar of Mr. Bevan's standing and reputation addressing hims again to one of the most critical political problems of the day. His bo is marked by knowledge, sympathy, and vision, and cannot but do go both here and in India. He is deeply conscious of the serious nature of t Indian situation :

"Unfortunately, it by no means follows, when two bodies of men are moving to a collision, that because the more clear-sighted on each side see that the collision would be a catastrophe for both, which reasonableness could easily avoid, the catastrophe will therefore be avoided."

He does not feel that we can leave India, nor can he believe in Dominion Home Rule, for that means leaving India if India is to be on the same footing as Canada. He urges that the weakness of the people is the cause of foreign government, and that therefore the urgent need is to make the people strong—physically, economically, intellectually—and able to express an effective public opinion. If in these ways India can develop a forward-looking Nationalism to displace the backward-looking Nationalism which has been its bane in the past, it should grow a nation to which control could ultimately be surrendered. British officials could help greatly by adding friendliness to the high sense of duty that is now characteristic of them.

A wise and timely book, with, strange to say, the chapter on religion as its weakest chapter.

No one has done more than Mr. C. F. Andrews to interpret, and indeed to reconcile, India and Britain to each other. His new book, *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is another step in this work of mutual interpretation. It is the first of two volumes, the one to come being Gandhi's autobiography. The present volume perhaps contains nothing new to those who see *Young India* and have kept in touch with Gandhi's life and witness, but it is useful to have collected in this way Gandhi's views on religion and politics, and on the problems in which they find expression—*swadeshi, khaddar,* untouchability, and the rest. Mr. Andrews has been in the closest touch with Gandhi for many years, in South Africa as well as India, and he speaks with peculiar authority, indicating the correct interpretation of Gandhi's views at all the critical stages in his career.

No Christian can read these pages without a profound feeling of shame that the lives of Christians have often been so divorced from their beliefs as to keep "seekers" away from Christ.

Mr. C. Delisle Burns's *Democracy, Its Defects and Advantages* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) is worth both reading and keeping for reference. Mr. Burns writes as a believer in the common man, and in the part he can and ought to play in the life of the world. He has things to say that go home: "It is childish for the superior person to condemn the dustman for his lack of culture, so long as this superior person does not remove his own refuse". The chapter on "The Spiritual Power" has similar things to say to the Church, which "as a social unit either has no mind at all or no power to express it". But Mr. Burns is scarcely fair to the Church. The Free Churches, for example, have often witnessed bravely for social justice, and there is probably more liberty of prophesying in the churches to-day than in, say, the Labour Party—as Mr. Maxton would be prepared to agree.

Mr. Mark Starr's *Lies and Hate in Education* (Hogarth Press, 5s.) is one of those books that make us pray to be saved from our friends. There is good work to be done in purifying history textbooks and in showing the menace of nationalism and party spirit in education (on the lines of Mr. J. F. Scott's book reviewed a short time ago), but the temper of Mr. Starr's contribution is such that the remedy is quite as bad as the disease.

What *is* rationalization? How many times has not that question been asked during the last two years? There is now no excuse for ignorance, for Mr. L. Urwick, the Director of the International Management Institution at Geneva, has clearly answered the question in *The Meaning of Rationalization* (Nisbet, 7s. 6d.), which explains the history of the movement and its practical utility.

Reviewing for a *Quarterly* is an interesting business. At times you write a review before any other notice appears, and the comparison of your verdict with those of others is always a pleasant occupation. At times you do not get to a book until you have read other notices, which almost, in spite of yourself, predispose you to praise or blame. Abbé Dimnet's *The Art of Thinking* (Cape, 6s.) was in the latter class: I opened it with the knowledge that it was an American "best seller", and that X, Y, and Z thought highly of it. Possibly it is to that cause that my disappointment must be attributed, for the book strikes me as being made up of bright, glittering superficialities. It is always lucid, but contains many sparkling generalizations that do not help very much, while a good deal of platitudinizing is mixed up with considerable ingenuity in presenting the truths of psychology in popular fashion.

Under the title *The Sense of Glory* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.) Mr. Herbert Read has reprinted nine papers from the *Times Literary Supplement.* They deal with Froissart, Malory, Descartes, Swift, Vauvenargues, Sterne, Hawthorne, Bagehot, and Henry James. They go well together, though it is hard to believe that Bagehot—or even Hawthorne and James—have ever been associated with glory before!

We must be allowed to suspend judgment on Mr. Mark Van Doren's *An Anthology of World Poetry* (Cassell, 10s. 6d.), for it is only by time and use that one can estimate a collection which contains 1,222 pp. of poems culled from 17 languages from Chinese to English, and from 3500 B.C. to 1929 A.D. Mr. Van Doren's plan has been to include only those poems that have been adequately translated into English: Pindar is thus omitted, though Cowley, Swift, Ben Jonson, Herrick, Byron, and many more swell out Martial's pages. Waley is, of course, the main stand-by for Chinese and Japanese. But a hundred and one points for discussion and enquiry suggest themselves as we turn the pages. We can only recommend readers to examine for themselves a collection as remarkable as it is cheap.

In *Selected Poems* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) Mr. W. B. Yeats has arranged chronologically "whatever lyrical and narrative poems of mine best please my friends or myself or best illuminate one another". They range from *Crossways* in 1889 to *The Tower* in 1928.

Very neat and tasteful are the volumes in " The County Anthologies" series (Mathews & Marrot, 6s., 3s., and 2s. 6d.), the first three of which are *Yorkshire, Derbyshire,* and *Lanarkshire.* Mr. R. Pape Cowell is the general editor, and the compilers draw on both prose and verse in the attempt "to survey and illustrate the debt of English literature to the scenery and special genius of individual counties". Anthologies are largely a matter of individual taste, but we should have liked to see a little more dialect in the *Yorkshire* volume: and while we appreciate the tributes that "furriners" like Scott and Wordsworth pay to our county its natives might have been drawn on a little more!

Equally attractive is the "English Heritage" series, edited by Lord Lee and Mr. J. C. Squire, and delightfully introduced by Mr. Stanley Baldwin. The opening volumes have been carefully chosen, and while they differ widely in both content and style, they are alike in being readable—and worth reading. They are Mr. John Bailey's *Shakespeare,* Mr. Bernard Darwin's *The English Public School,* Mr. Eric Parker's *English Wild Life,* and Mr. J. B. Priestley's *English Humour* (Longmans, 3s. 6d. each).

Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's third series of *Studies in Literature* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.) is as delightful as its predecessors. We specially enjoyed the papers on Coventry Patmore, W. S. Gilbert, and "The New Reading Public".

Vols. 10 and 11 of the Hogarth Lectures (Hogarth Press, 3s. 6d.) are Mr. Humbert Wolfe's *Notes on English Verse Satire* and Mr. G. D. H. Cole's *Politics and Literature.* Mr. Wolfe's lively sketch surveys the subject from Chaucer and Skelton to Chesterton and Sassoon. The title of Mr. Cole's book is certainly misleading. It deals with this country only, begins only with the seventeenth century, and suddenly stops short with Shelley, Coleridge, and Byron. What there is is good—though there is more politics than literature—and the "Conclusion" is extremely apt. But a title should have been chosen which would have better indicated the range and limits of the essay.

No better way of beginning the study of the Icelandic Saga can be found than by reading Mr. E. E. Kellett's *The Northern Saga* (Hogarth Press, 7s. 6d.). After a readable and very useful Introduction, Mr. Kellett gives 130 pages to translations of fourteen of the stories.

Pride and Prejudice (Heinemann, 3s. 6d.) is a play in four acts adapted by Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Squire from the novel. Mr. and Mrs. Squire have managed to give a good deal of animation to the play, which, we imagine, would give Jane Austen considerable surprise could she see it.

We confess with shame that we had never read Goncharov's *Oblomov* before receiving Miss Natalie Duddington's translation (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.). Now we have read it we wonder why its praises have not been more constantly and insistently proclaimed. It is the story of one whose life "was permeated by . . . primeval laziness, simplicity, peace, and inertia", and of an attempt—almost successful—of a woman "to carry you on her wings out of your stagnation". Zahar and Olga deserve immortality along with Oblomov—and masterpiece is indeed the only correct description of the book.

Mr. Hugh Walpole has given us no finer character than the old man who gives his name to *Hans Frost* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.). On his seventieth birthday a fresh young girl of nineteen—a niece—comes into the life of Hans Frost, whose books have made him a figure in the world, and whose position as a celebrity his wife, Ruth, makes it her business to maintain. Nathalie's influence proves altogether disturbing to the old man, who is shaken out of the coma of comfort into which he was gradually sinking. With wonderful skill Mr. Walpole describes their effect on each other, and its inevitable *dénouement.* The frustration of Ruth's schemes cannot but give pleasure to readers, but they will hope to learn how Nathalie and Vladimir get on.

Miss Aelfrida Tillyard's second novel, *The Way We Grow Up* (Hutchinson, 7s. 6d.) is the story of the way in which four Cambridge graduates faced life when they went down, and especially of one of them who was determined to lead the battle of youth against age. We enjoyed the book, but, while we are not surprised at anything that comes from Cambridge, we find it difficult to find anyone surviving a University course and remaining as unsophisticated as Roy.

Congregationalists, and especially Yorkshire Congregationalists, will read with great interest Mr. Gordon Stowell's *The History of Button Hill* (Gollancz, 10s. 6d.), for it is an account of the rise and fall of a suburb of the city of "Fleece", written round a forty years Congregational pastorate. It is well written and will hold the attention even of those who are quite ignorant of the locality. Our only objection is to the classification of the work as a novel. All the way through one is conscious that the writer is describing events which he has seen—and sometimes shared—rather than drawing on imagination. This is not to claim that a novelist cannot use his own experiences, but in this case we are continually tempted to identify, not merely places, but characters, always conscious that what we are reading is more or less history. As a study of a suburb which rapidly becomes down-town, and of organized Christianity's failure to cope with the changing situation, Button Hill is admirable. We hope, however, that now this book is out of the way Mr. Stowell will give rein to his imagination.

It was intriguing to find side by side on the table two books on education, one dealing with Africa, the other with England. Mr. A. V. Murray's *The School in the Bush* (Longman's, 12s. 6d.)—the not very happy title of "a critical study of the theory and practice of native education in Africa"—is based upon a nine months' tour undertaken with the special object of studying native education, and especially the training of teachers. Mr. Murray's book covers a tremendous amount of ground, for not only did he travel widely, but he tries to give us the background against which village life must be seen. Some of the things we first looked for are missing, but we found the volume full of information of a kind it would be difficult to find elsewhere, while Mr. Murray's comments are always fresh and penetrating.

In *The English Tradition of Education* (Murray, 10s. 6d.) the Headmaster of Harrow also covers a good deal of ground. He, too, has an almost impossible task, for he has practically set out to answer the question of the beaming gentleman from Tokio he mentions, who produced his notebook with the words, " By what methods do you produce the English Public School spirit? ". Dr. Norwood believes that in our tradition of education we have at hand the instrument that can create an educated democracy; " the great hope of the world," he says, " lies in an education which is based on religion, on doing the Will of God, and whose end is before everything else the production of character; it must put right action before knowledge and right opinion." Beginning with a discussion of the public school—its religion, discipline, culture, athletics, *etc.*—he passes on to consider education in general, and ends with a section devoted to future prospects, in which he sees education triumphantly uniting the ideals expressed in Ford and Gandhi.

Volumes of children's addresses continue to pour forth. Here are three, very different, but all of them good, the first two, *Shells and Bits*

of Glass and *Nuts and Nut Crackers* (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.) by Congregational ministers, the Revs. B. R. H. Spaull and R. E. Thomas, and the Rev. John Macbeath's *Lamps and Lamplighters* (Carey Press, 2s. 6d.). From New Zealand comes the Rev. J. Cocker's *Keep Climbing* (Allenson, 3s. 6d.), which contains 26 addresses of a more conventional type, but of their kind very good, while the Rev. David Miller's *The Spider's Telephone Wire* (Allenson, 6s.), which is from Australia, benefits greatly by Mrs. Falkiner's illustrations.

A large book, no doubt intended as a gift book for children, is Miss Theodora W. Wilson's *The Parables of Our Lord* (R.T.S., 7s. 6d.), with sixteen coloured illustrations by Harold Copping. The combination of Miss Wilson and Mr. Copping is a good one, for both have achieved success in their respective fields.

A boy will desire no better book for a Christmas present than Mr. John Budden's *Further Adventures of Jungle John* (Longmans, 6s.), which we cordially commend.

EDITOR.

In his *Paul the Man, His Life and His Ministry* (Williams & Norgate, 5s.) Dr. C. E. Macartney tells in vigorous fashion the story of Paul's life as that life is understood by those untroubled by the researches of *N.T.* critics. His narrative is naturally chiefly based on *Acts*, but he supplements the story by reference to the *Epistles* and by that kind of picturesque description of places which a much-travelled man can use. The book makes no contribution to our understanding of Paul, but within its limits it may be very useful to Sunday School teachers and others who will prize its vivid style. The caption on the wrapper tells us that "it presents an intimate picture of the man rather than the theologian." We doubt if in Paul's case such a distinction has any meaning. To understand Paul, Luke's eirenical narrative helps less than Paul's intensely personal and often passionate own words. We get nearest to Paul as we study the *Epistles* in the light of the thought of his own age, instead of trying to transpose him directly into ours. This book has the great merit of being interesting, and may serve as a running commentary on the latter half of *Acts*.

A Critical Analysis of the Four Chief Pauline Epistles (Watts, 12s. 6d.) is a depressing book. Its author, Mr. L. Gordon Rylands, has obviously devoted to it much time and thought, but to the reviewer it seems a *reductio ad absurdum* of learned but unintelligent criticism. Holding that Paul was a Gnostic, the writer seeks to indicate the original nuclei of *Romans* and 1 and 2 *Cor.*, which may possibly be assigned to Paul. Thus of *Romans*, "disregarding minor interpolations," this nucleus is comprised in 1^{16}-2^{29}, 6^{1}-7^{6}, $8^{3\text{-}28, 38, 39}$, $12^{1, 2, 11}$. *Galatians*, which surely is too personal and passionate to have been written by any but Paul, he regards as entirely non-Pauline, and assigns its original section to A.D. 90; its second addition to 120 A.D.; its third to 140 A.D. That seems to us simply impossible. It is hard to believe that this long book, for all its learning and its ability, will engage the attention of serious scholars.

SYDNEY CAVE.

If we can conceive the Editor of this *Quarterly* and the late Editor of the *Holborn Review* rolled into one, his name is Dr. Lowther Clarke. He reads, or rather "tears the heart out of", over 1,000 books a year and has a marvellous knowledge of current German theological literature. I am always disappointed if the monthly issue of *Theology* has no contribution

from him. In *New Testament Problems* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) he has happily gathered together a number of his essays, studies, and reviews, and the result is a very scholarly and stimulating volume. Perhaps one may single out "The Formgeschichtlich Method" and "Eduard Meyer on the Origins of Christianity", but the comments on certain Markan, Johannine, and Pauline texts runs them very close in a collection of twenty-three papers of which we would not willingly lose one.

There is nothing in Dr. van Rhyn's *Treasures of the Dust* (S.C.M. 4s. 6d.) that has not been before the English speaking reader for over twenty years and is familiar to all who know their Deissmann and Moulton their Milligan and Meecham. The Dutch public for whom the book (here translated) is meant may have been less fortunate. The story and the significance of the papyri and "recently" discovered MSS. and inscriptions is, however, brightly told, and will no doubt have the charm of freshness to many people.

The Gospel of the Living Jesus (Macmillan, 10s.) is by T. H. Davies, M.A. Neither title-page nor preface furnishes any further information about the author, but his work reveals an intelligent and devout mind. It is a series of studies in the Gospel whose aim is to present the spiritual character of Jesus as an ever recreating dynamic.

The commendation given in January, 1926, to Dr. Joseph Klausner's *Jesus of Nazareth* (Allen & Unwin) on its first appearance is warmly endorsed on its re-issue at the cheaper price of 12s. 6d.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

"A study of Jesus' own personal experience of religion." So Dr. W. E. Bundy describes his book, *The Religion of Jesus* (Cassell, 12s. 6d.) with the amplifying comment that "all of his (Jesus') utterances are deeply personal; they are fresh extracts from his own experience". At first blush this does not hold out much prospect of freshness; but Dr. Bundy puts his points with distinctive force, and he has an effective method of sifting the wheat from the chaff, *i.e.*, what he deems the essential and permanently valuable elements in Jesus' outlook and teaching from the local and ephemeral. "To base the religious authority of Jesus on the Immaculate Conception, the Virgin Birth, the historicity of the nature-miracles or even on the resurrection, is distorted devotion to primitive Christian values". Although his style suffers from redundancy, Dr. Bundy fulfils his promise of writing so that the layman can easily follow his argument. And, whether they do or do not agree with his conclusions, ministers may find it useful to study his way of doing what we all have to do—show our hearers how to penetrate through the forest of tradition and accretion to the real Jesus.

It is a pity that Dr. Robert Norwood, one of the New York clergy, has handicapped his book with such a title as *The Man Who Dared to be God: A Story of Jesus* (Scribners, 10s. 6d.), especially as it has no particular appropriateness as describing this new effort to give children in story-form an account of "the most important man this planet has produced". Jesus developed wonderful powers because he found God; but he did not work miracles, "if by that word you understand magic". This sufficiently indicates the theological standpoint of a book written with lively imagination and picturesqueness. Certain passages in the Foreword and in the story itself call for adult interpretation to make them fully intelligible to "the children of this generation" to whom the volume is dedicated.

"No one will ever know what any bishop really believes." Dr. Masterman, who is, of course, Bishop of Plymouth, quotes this hard saying of a recent writer, and, surely needlessly, enters the plea that he "does really believe" all that he writes in *The Christianity of To-morrow* (Cassell, 7s. 6d.). His thinking is of the steadily progressive order, and on various aspects of present-day religion he is an admirable guide for the many thoughtful Anglicans who do not want to go too fast, and yet do not want to stand still.

Why Am I a Christian? (Cassell, 3s. 6d.) is a series of Lenten addresses in the Bishop of London's well-known manner. An interesting feature is the presentation of questions and answers arising out of the addresses as they were delivered. This section of the book reminds us of what we are apt to forget, that, from time to time, Dr. Ingram has done useful apologetic work of the more simple and direct sort.

ARTHUR PRINGLE.

The Middle Ages are no longer the Dark Ages. Light has been poured upon them in recent years from all sides. Nevertheless further illumination as to their nature and character is always welcome. Since the modern world has learned to estimate the true value of its medieval predecessor, it is always ready for anything that contributes to a clearer view of what it was. In *Latin Thought during the Middle Ages* (Oxford Press, 5s.), the Professor of Italian in the University of Oxford (Prof. Cesare Foligno) has contributed a short study of the place of the Roman and Latin tradition in the making of the medieval order. He examines the resistance of the new peoples to this tradition and their assimilation of it. He shows how even in the worst and stormiest days the Roman tradition was never lost, and how in the end it re-asserted itself and what new forms were developed from it. There is a careful study of the place of Latin as a means of culture and an exhibition of the alternate attraction and repulsion which the Latin classics exercised upon the medieval Church. The theme is illustrated from abundant knowledge, and many interesting observations are made by the way.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

After historical outlines of the British Hegelian contendings (Part I), and of movements of recoil (Part II) the Rev. E. G. Braham's *Ourselves and Reality* (Sharp, 10s. 6d.) states the author's own case for Divine personality and for the immortality of man (Part III). One fails to discern a definite progress of thought uniting the manifold details; and one deplores an incredible multitude of misprints or carelessnesses; A. E. Taylor's "Problems of Conduct"; "T. H. Muirhead"; "*Drie* Buecher"; "G. C. S. Schille"; "Hermann" [of Marburg], four times over; "Tyrrel" "Troelsch"; "cosmogany"; "affirmity". On p. 201, James Ward is made to write bad grammar; Browning is massacred on p. 217. Nor are graver errors lacking. P. 177, Henry Jones was "only slightly influenced by Hegel—perhaps indirectly, through Lotze". This of Jones, Edward Caird's favourite pupil, selected on Caird's instigation to succeed him at Glasgow! Has Mr. Braham ever read Jones's attack on Lotze? P. 170; Ritschl "will not pronounce upon the historical existence of Christ"!!! What next?

British scholarship gains nothing in *éclat* from such work as this.

Prof. Hans Driesch, eminent in science, is also deeply interested in the problems of philosophy, as (*e.g.*) his Gifford Lectures have shown. The

present short volume, *Man and the Universe* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) is intended for the general reader. The characterization on the jacket—"inspired by a generous revolt against the domination of will and intellect"—is somewhat misleading; the author makes room indeed for faith, but *all* knowledge—according to him—is to be acquired by intellectual processes. Reality includes those vital "entelechies" of which Driesch is the champion, as well as mechanical causes; and by that discovery intellect justifies the spirit's revolt against fate. Yet, strangely, the discussion of free-will ends in a *non liquet;* and, while immortality in some "worthy" sense is pronounced morally inevitable, the thought of God seems wondrous obscure.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

Dr. A. C. Ewing's *The Morality of Punishment* (Kegan Paul, 10s. 6d.) investigates the general moral principles involved in the practice of punishment. He examines the various theories, the retributive, the deterrent, and the reformatory. Retribution, the eye for an eye theory, though the oldest justification of punishment, the rough justice which repays the criminal in kind, seems to have neither logical nor ethical ground. It is no more than getting one's own back. Is the deterrent theory any better? It tends to become inhumanly severe and disregards the truth that punishment should be educative, reformatory. Dr. Ewing discusses fully the methods of educative punishment, and the parallel problem of rewards. He sets out a list of objections to State punishment. Finally and inevitably the discussion passes on to outline certain aspects of a general theory of ethics. The author thinks that the nature of evil is to become worse when practised until it ultimately dissatisfies and is followed by a reaction towards good. It is in the nature of things that crime is its own punishment.

The book is a full and interesting treatment of a subject which has not been much written about lately.

Dr. George Walker's *The Idealism of Christian Ethics* (Clark, 7s.) contains the Baird Lectures delivered in the University of Aberdeen by the Minister of the East Parish of St. Nicholas. They treat the Christian ethic in comparison with other systems, Greek, Buddhist, or evolutionary, and show that while Christianity does not abolish the moral gains of other ages, it completes them by adding a new ideal, both for the individual and society. There is a full and careful discussion of the Kingdom of God, of the several Christian virtues, as also of the two great commandments, and a final chapter on the power of the Spirit to create a new life in man.

H. B. SHEPHEARD.

NEW EDITIONS AND REPRINTS.

EMIL LUDWIG. Goethe. Putnam. 2 vols. 15s. Popular Edition.

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD. *Margaret Ethel Macdonald.* Allen & Unwin. 5s. 11th Impression (6th Edition) of the Prime Minister's beautiful memoir, with a new prefatory note.

MRS. C. S. PEEL. *A Hundred Wonderful Years.* "Being an account of social and domestic life in England from 1820 to 1920." Bodley Head. 8s. 6d. Cheaper ed. of a book first published in 1926.

HENRI DE CATT. *Frederick the Great.* Constable's Miscellany. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

H. W. Fowler. *If Wishes were Horses.* Allen & Unwin. 6s. These essays by the arbiter of "Modern English Usage" were published in 1907 under the title *Si Mihi*—! and the name "Egomet."

Edward Grubb. *What is Quakerism?* Allen & Unwin. 4s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. 3rd completely revised ed. of a book first published in 1917.

Paul Popenoe. *Modern Marriage: A Handbook.* Macmillan. 8s. 6d. First published, 1925.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

W. B. Selbie. *The Christian Ethic in the Individual, the Family, and the State.* Sharp. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d. The Beckly Lecture. A clear and candid utterance.

W. Douglas Mackenzie. *Man's Consciousness of Immortality.* Harvard & Oxford Univ. Presses. 4s. 6d. Ingersoll Lecture.

A. D. Lindsay. *The Essentials of Democracy.* Oxford Univ. Press. 3s. 6d. Wm. J. Cooper Lectures.

C. G. Montefiore. *IV Ezra.* Allen & Unwin. 2s. and 1s. Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture. "A Study in the Development of Universalism."

K. E. Iinnes. *The Reign of Law.* Hogarth Press. 1s. 6d. "A Short and Simple Introduction to the Work of the Permanent Court of International Justice."

W. J. Rowland. *Some Difficulties of the Burial Law in Cemeteries.* Liberation Society. 6d.

F. H. Ballard. *Justification by Faith.* Indep. Press. 3d.

A. J. Costain. *The Jamboree*, 1929. Sharp. 2d. An Address by the Head Master of Rydal School.

A. S. Rowntree. *Colleges for the People.* Educational Settlements Association. 2d.

ALSO RECEIVED.

A Short Bible in the A.V. Chosen and arranged by the Bishop of Liverpool and others. Blackwell. 3s. 6d. and (School ed.) 2s. 6d.

The School Bible. Selections from the A.V. Nelson. 2s.

"The Study Bible"—4 new vols. Cassell. 3s. 6d. each. *Major Prophets* (Bp. of Durham, Dr. Wheeler Robinson and Dr. Lofthouse); *Minor Prophets* (Bp. of Plymouth and Dr. Box); *Corinthians* (Bp. of Middleton and Dr. Underwood); *Ephesians to Philemon* (Dr. Orchard and Dr. N. P. Williams).

Augusta A. Temple. *Flowers and Trees of Palestine.* S.P.C.K. 6s. Introduction, Alphabetical List, and 30 Illustrations.

W. H. S. Jones. *What did Jesus Mean?* Heffer. 1s. 6d. An Essay.

Paul B. Bull. *The Way of Conversion.* Faith Press. 3s. and 2s.; *Instructions on the Atonement.* Faith Press. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.

J. Emrys Morgan. *The Unending Benediction;* Gwilym Rees. *How to Handle Life.* Stockwell. 2s. 6d. each.

Horace Colly. *The Parable of the Potter, and Other Sermons.* Sharp. 3s.

Archer Wallace. *Blazing New Trails.* Allenson. 2s. 6d. Stories of 15 Mission Pioneers.

A. Chester Mann. *F. B. Meyer.* Allen & Unwin. 3s. 6d.

Rendel Harris. *A New Stonehenge; Barley; Minister; Mustard.* Heffer, 2s. each. "Caravan Essays," in which Dr. Harris continues to find traces of Egypt in England.

R. F. Moorshead. *"Heal the Sick."* Carey Press. 3s. 6d. The Story of the 25 Years' Work of the Medical Mission Auxiliary of the Baptist Missionary Society, by the Society's Medical Secretary.

H. Fleming. *The Lighted Mind.* Friends' Book Centre. 1s. 6d. "The Challenge of Adult Education to Quakerism."

C. Edmund Maurice. *Poems.* Methuen. 5s.

F. L. Wheeler. *Modernity.* Williams & Norgate. 3s. 6d.

REPORTS, LESSON COURSES, ETC.

Advance. 130th Annual Report of the Religious Tract Society. R.T.S. 2s. 6d.

Keswick Convention, 1929. Pickering & Inglis. 4s. and 2s. 6d.

Purpose. 35th Annual Report of the Student Christian Movement. S.C.M. 6d.

Concise Guides to Primary, Junior (or International) and Intermediate Lessons for 1930; *Notes on the Scripture Lessons* (*Uniform,* 1930). N.S.S.U. 4s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. each; *Notes on the Morning Lessons.* N.S.S.U. 2s. 6d.; *Pocket Notes.* N.S.S.U. 1s. 9d., 2s. 3d., and 2s. 9d.

The Claims of Life. Adult School Lesson Handbook, 1930. N.A.S.U. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.; *The Bible and Social Reform.* Study Outlines. N.A.S.U. 6d.

Messrs. Pickering & Inglis send a selection of their Golden Grain Diaries and Almanacs (various prices), and of their stories as follows: Robt. Simpson, *Martyrland,* 2s. 6d.; Charlotte Murray, *Love Conquereth,* 2s.; S. E. Burrow, *Brindlewood Farm,* 1s. 6d.; E. Everett Green, *Her Husband's Home,* 2s. 6d.; Flora Berry, *Neta Lyall,* 2s.; G. Pettman, *For Coronet or Crown?,* 1s. 6d. Also James Smith, *Handfuls of Purpose,* Vol. X, 4s.; J. B. Watson, *The Sinless Saviour,* 2s. 6d.; G. Goodman, *Great Truth Simply Stated,* 2s. 6d.; Jesse Page, *Capt. Allen Gardiner of Patagonia,* 2s.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The Holborn Review (October). Prof. W. L. Wardle has been given the difficult task of succeeding Dr. Peake as Editor. The next number is to be a Peake Memorial Number: this issue contains tributes by Profs. Wardle and Humphries. Among the articles are the Rev. H. J. Flowers's "The Modern Value of the New Testament" and the Rev. J. C. Mantripp's "Idealism and the Church." There are five literary articles, in one of which the Rev. R. Newman Wycherley gives a needed warning about Froude's *Bunyan.*

The Hibbert Journal (October). The first three articles deal with economic questions—Principal Barratt Brown's "Machinery—A Blessing or a Curse," Mr. G. A. Johnston's "The Rationalisation of Consumption," and Prof. G. H. Turnbull's The Linking of Education and Occupation." Mr. Edmond Holmes criticises Prof. Alexander's new realism, Mr. G. M. Sargeaunt writes on "The Death of Plato." Two articles deal with the Fourth Gospel—Prof. B. W. Bacon's "History and Dogma in John," and Dr. C. F. Nolloth's "The Fourth Gospel and Its Critics." The Bishop of Madras writes on "Church Union in South India." The three most interesting contributions are Dr. Hugh Brown's "'Playing the Game' As Divine," Mr. C. G. Montefiore's "The Originality of Jesus," and Prof. A. W. Vernon's "Is Religion to be De-personalised?"

The London Quarterly (October). The Rev. W. E. Garman opens with a strong plea for the Scheme of Church Union in South India. Dr. Ballard writes trenchantly on Dr. Orchard's *The Present Crisis in Religion.* Among other articles are Mr. Lovat-Fraser's "Andrew Jackson," the Rev. S. G. Dimond's "Euripides," and the Rev. W. Wood's "God and the Moral Law."

The Baptist Quarterly (October). The chief articles are "William Medley and Friedrich von Hügel" (Rev. P. F. Chambers), "Authority" (Rev. S. Ruper Ward) and "Christian Traditions: Their Value and Their Channels" (unsigned).

The Modern Churchman (September-November). The Conference Number dealing with "The Problem of Authority." Dean Inge gave the opening address fourteen speakers, among them Prof. Ernest Barker, Prof. W. R. Sorley

nd Principal Galloway, dealt with various aspects of the subject, and two ermons were delivered. Dr. Major writes an Introduction. There is much hat calls for careful thought in the volume, but much, too, that seems academic nd remote from practical considerations.

The Church Quarterly Review (October). The Bishop of Gloucester writes on Two Lives of Christ " (Bishop Gore's and Prof. F. C. Burkitt's), Miss A. M. ooke on " St. Francis of Assisi," the Rev. C. T. Harley Walker on " Religious onditions in Rumania," the Rev. Edgar Vincent on " Some Aspects of the nglish Reformation," and Miss E. L. Veitch on " Fortunatus." There are me learned notices of books. A welcome article is Dr. E. J. Martin's " Thomas dward Brown."

The Expository Times (August-November). The " Books that have influenced ur Epoch " which are discussed are Moberly's *Atonement and Personality* (Dr. . P. Williams), *Literature and Dogma* (Dr. Moffatt), *Sartor Resartus* (Dr. W. . Paterson) and *The Religion of the Semites* (Rev. W. M. Mathieson). Prof. . R. Mackintosh writes on the Scottish Union: Congregational contributors are r. Selbie, who writes an appreciation of Dr. Peake, and the Rev. J. Emrys lorgan, whose subject is " The Church as the Home of the Spiritual Life."

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Tenth Month). " From the House of the Four Vinds " examines a problem which puzzles the Friends as it puzzles all the hurches about their own young people: " Why do two-thirds of children who re Quakers when they leave school cease to be Quakers?" Mary L. Robinson rites on " The Mysticism of the Society of Friends: A Study in Silence," J. S. oyland on " The Hindu Belief in Re-Incarnation," and Leonard Wigham on Early Chinese Philosophers." Mrs. Holdsworth continues to tell of " Halcyon ays in New Zealand," and there is a very interesting article on birds.

The Review of the Churches (October). Among the many striking articles this number we found most suggestive the Rev. H. H. Farmer's " The Task Modern Evangelisation," Mr. Arnold Lunn's " A Challenge to Pacifists," and r. Lynch's " Candidates for the Ministry in the U.S.A." Two articles deal ith the union of the Scottish Churches, and two with the Lateran Treaty. Dr. oulton thwacks Mr. Belloc, Prof. Claude Jenkins writes on F. D. Maurice, and r. Edward Grubb on " Spirituality in Religion."

The British Journal of Inebriety (October). The papers in this number are r. McAdam Eccles's " Some Gaps in the Scientific Study of Inebriety," Sir illiam Willcox's " The Toxic Effects of Methylated Spirits and Impure Forms Alcohol," and Dr. P. B. Wilkinson's " Cannabis Indica: An Historical and harmacological Study of the Drug." The 30 pages given to book reviews are ry useful.

The International Review of Missions (October). Dr. D. M. Donaldson writes " The First Missionaries to the Parthians," Dr. J. L. Barton on " The ar East Relief." On the Bishop of Dornakal's " Living Forces Behind Mass ovements " we comment in the Editorial. Dr. H. T. Hodgkin's " The Con- uctive Task of the Church in China " is very important; Mr. F. T. B. Friis's Mandates and Missions " is timely. Two medical men, Dr. Vaughan and Dr. dd, discuss " Medical Missionary Policy and the Health of Missionaries," and ere is the usual bibliography.

World Dominion (October). The Editorial deals with pagan Britain, Mr. thur Black with pagan London. Thus beginning from Jerusalem the journal en reaches out to the uttermost parts of the earth, the concluding article, Dr. J. A. Mackay, dealing with " Spiritual Spring-Time in Latin America."

The Evangelical Quarterly (October). The main articles are Prof. A. H. yce's " Archæology and the Old Testament," Mr. A. Stuart's " Genesis and ology," Dr. E. C. Unmack's " Why We Reject the Apocrypha," the Rev. . Graham Scroggie's " Why We Are Protestants," and Prof. T. C. Johnson's Justification by Faith." In the five lines given to our last issue there are ly four mistakes!

The Yale Review (Autumn). Mr. Walter Lippmann pleads for a statesmanlike approach to the problem of Law Enforcement, and Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe writes on "England Looks Towards America." Mme. Edib discusses "Dictatorship and Reforms in Turkey," Mr. Ray Morris "Economic Changes in South America," Prof. de Madariaga "New Life in Spain." Mr. Gamaliel Bradford writes of the life of Catharine the Great under the title "Eve Enthroned," and there is a story by Mr. Walter de la Mare.

The Review and Expositor (Bapt., Louisville, Kentucky, October). Dr. C. H. Nash writes on "The Foundation and Superstructure of the Church of Jesus Christ," and Dr. W. E. Henry on "The Search for Truth." Dr. W. T. Whitley contributes an interesting study of the early church under the title "From Variety Towards Uniformity."

The Anglican Theological Review (October). Dr. C. L. Dibble writes usefully on "Contrasted Philosophies of Christianity," and Dr. F. J. Hall on "Catholic Christology Grandly Vindicated"—a review of the Rev. L. S. Thornton's *The Incarnate Lord*. The Editor contributes a reading course on "The History of Christian Thought," and Dr. F. H. Hallock has a learned article on "Coptic Gnostic Writings."

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE FREE CHURCHES AND UNITY.

Sir,—May I bear my grateful testimony to the admirable paper by Mr. Parry on this subject. One can heartily endorse almost every word of it, and the whole of its spirit and outlook, without qualification. But I venture to take exception to the statement that in reference to Reunion "probably the greatest difficulty of all is the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration." I find it difficult to argue at all about this revival of an ancient pagan doctrine which seems to me to impute to the Father of spirits an incredible pettiness and cruelty. But surely the fact that this rite is held to be "valid" among Roman Catholics if administered by a midwife or anyone else in an emergency removes it to a secondary place.

I submit that the primary and supreme difficulty is the belief in priesthood, whether with or without Apostolic Succession. The Prayer Book is saturated with this utterly unchristian doctrine, as any thoughtful reader can see. It obtrudes itself in all the services of Ordination, in the service of Holy Communion, in the pronouncement of the Absolution, &c. This surely is the bed rock of the sacramental system, in both the Anglican and Roman Churches, and they both inherited and adapted it from the pagan cults of Babylon and Egypt. Once get rid of the priest, and baptism would, like all other items of ritual, sink into comparative insignificance.

Yours truly,

J. E. FLOWER.